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CREDITS
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PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the “YES” or after the word “NO”.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNIQUEMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra “SI” o después de la palabra “NO”.

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

選民須知:

選票你所選擇的任何其他候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選票你要投選的候選人打孔，但不超過要選舉的確定人數。

選選合併的非原定的候選人，請在非原定候選人選票信封所提供的預定空位上選下該候選人所競選的職位和候選人姓名。

選選任何提案，請在選票上箭頭所指“YES”或“NO”字樣打孔。

選票上若有圈着兩點或抹掉者，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔了，請務必填滿了；或者損壞了非原定候選人的選票信封，應把該選票退還給選舉員的監票員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

Para comenzar a votar vuelva a la próxima página.
### President and Vice President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>for President</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td>for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>for President</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMA WONG MAR</td>
<td>for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. MONDALE</td>
<td>for President</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALDINE A. FERRARO</td>
<td>for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BERGLAND</td>
<td>for President</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES A. LEWIS</td>
<td>for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB RICHARDS</td>
<td>for President</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN KENNEDY SALAMAN</td>
<td>for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### United States Representative 5th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizador de la Comunidad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profesor de Economía</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress, 5th District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diputado al Congress, Distrito #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Accountant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contador Público</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## State Senator 3rd District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILTON MARKS, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS, Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIA BELLI, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK PICKENS, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Member of the State Assembly 17th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR., Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE S. DOLSON, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Occupation/Role</td>
<td>Vote Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Community Service Attorney</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Administrator</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT D. INGRAHAM</td>
<td>Political Consultant</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR M. DAVIS</td>
<td>Hi-Tech Business Woman, Mujer de Negocios / Campo Tecnológico</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td>Management Consultant</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE B. KENNEDY</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP</td>
<td>Attorney, Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SALEH ABDULLA</td>
<td>Real Estate Salesman, Vendedor de Bienes y Raíces</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUZANNE ALBERTO</td>
<td>Administrative Secretary</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE RENNE</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Political Scientist / Educator</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIANNE MALVEAUX</td>
<td>Economics Professor / Writer</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN L. MOLINARI</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPORTANT:** There are two (2) pages of candidates for Supervisor. (29 candidates, vote for 6)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES</td>
<td>Banker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Banquero 銀行家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS</td>
<td>Executor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ejecutor 執行人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant Socialista 社會主義聯盟鬥士</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>RUBY T. JIMENEZ</td>
<td>Directory Sales Representative Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representante de Ventas de Directorios 姓名地址錄推銷員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY ANDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>SFCC Student Estudiante de SFCC 市立大學學生</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>HARRY BRITT</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors 市參議員 (續下)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant Socialista 社會主義聯盟鬥士</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>RANDALL BRONNER</td>
<td>Artist, Musician 音樂家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>JONATHAN BULKLEY</td>
<td>Architect/Neighborhood Planner 建築師／街坊設計師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>ROGER BOSCHETTI</td>
<td>T.V. Ethnic Producer 电视少数民族製作人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Productor de Programas Étnicos de Televisión</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>KEVIN STARR</td>
<td>Businessman, Communicator, Professor 職人，信息員，教授</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>CAROL RUTH SILVER</td>
<td>Incumbent 現任市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>DAVID C. SMITH</td>
<td>Administrator, Service Agency 服務機構行政管理員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escritor, Movimiento Socialista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>JOHN E. WAHL</td>
<td>Attorney 材律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Writer, Socialist Action 作家，社會主義活動家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escritor, Movimiento Socialista</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE S. HOPP</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICK CERBATOS</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBBY DENEBEIM</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE DYKSTRA</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST “CHUCK” AYALA</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN GOODMAN</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE F. PEHARGOU</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOS C. BROWN</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM WOLFRED</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Clean Water Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $325,000,000 to provide funds for water pollution control, water conservation, and water reclamation projects and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>State School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance Cleanup Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for hazardous substance cleanup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $75,000,000 to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Veterans Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $650,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Senior Center Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $50,000,000 to provide funds for senior centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Property Taxation, Fire Protection Systems Exclusion. Empowers Legislature to exclude from property tax reassessment certain newly constructed fire protection improvements. Fiscal Impact: If implemented, estimated local government property tax revenue losses of less than $5 million annually, state government increases in costs to compensate for local school district property tax loss, and state government increases in income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Supreme Court, Transfer of Causes, Review of Decisions. Modifies existing constitutional provisions regarding transfer of cases and review of decisions. Fiscal Impact: No significant effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Voto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT. DISABLED PERSON. Authorizes Legislature to postpone property tax payments on owner occupied principal residence by disabled person. Fiscal Impact: State expenditures estimated to be less than $2 million annually which would be recovered, with interest, when the homes are sold.

PROPERTY TAXATION. HISTORIC STRUCTURE EXCLUSION. Excludes from property tax reassessment certain new construction on owner occupied principal residence historic structures. Fiscal Impact: Local governments property tax revenue loss of less than $100,000 annually. State government expenditure of about 32% of this to compensate local school districts for property tax revenue losses.

(Proposition 35 has been withdrawn from the ballot).

TAXATION. Amends Proposition 13 adding restrictions on real property taxation, new tax measures, and charging fees. Provides specified tax refunds. Fiscal Impact: State revenues reduced at least $100 million, net, over first two-year period. State costs increased up to $750 million over first two-year period and by about $150 million annually in subsequent years to replace revenue losses to schools. Local agencies other than schools property tax and other revenue losses of about $2.8 billion, net, over first two-year period and of about $1.1 billion annually in subsequent years.

STATE LOTTERY. Establishes state-operated lottery. Revenue use: prizes, 50%; expenses, not more than 16%; public education, at least 34%. Fiscal Impact: Cannot be predicted with certainty. Estimated yield for public education would be about $500 million annually, with less the first two years. Estimated division: K-12, 80%; Community Colleges, 13%; California State University, 5%; University of California, 2%.

VOTING MATERIALS. ENGLISH ONLY. Requires Governor urge federal officials amend law so that voting materials be printed in English only. Fiscal Impact: Insignificant.
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCION GENERAL, 6 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1984

POSTERGACIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. PERSONAS INHABILITADAS. Autoriza a la Legislatura a posponer los pagos del impuesto a la propiedad sobre una residencia principal ocupada por su dueño quien sea una persona inhabilitada. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales calculados en menos de $2 millones anuales, los cuales serían considerados, con intereses, cuando las residencias sean vendidas.

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE ESTRUCTURA HISTÓRICA. Exime del recaudo del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas construcciones o trabajos nuevos efectuados en residencias que son estructuras históricas ocupadas por sus dueños como el principal lugar de residencia. Impacto fiscal: Pérdidas para los gobiernos locales en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad de menos de $100,000 anuales. Gastos gubernamentales estatales alrededor del 3% de esta suma para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida de ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad.

La Proposición número 35 no será usada en esta elección.

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. Enmienda la Proposición 13 añadiendo restricciones en la fijación de impuestos a la propiedad inmueble, nuevas medidas de impuestos y honorarios a cobrar. Dispone reembolsos específicos de impuestos. Impacto fiscal: Reducción en los ingresos estatales en lo menos $100 millones anuales, durante el primer periodo de dos años. Aumento en los costos estatales de $375 millones durante el primer periodo de dos años y en unos $150 millones anuales en años subsecuentes para reemplazar la pérdida de ingresos para las escuelas. Pérdidas para otras agencias locales, además de para las escuelas. Impacto al impuesto a la propiedad y otras pérdidas de ingresos de alrededor de $2.8 mil millones anuales, durante el primer periodo de dos años y de alrededor de $1.1 mil millones anualmente en años subsecuentes.

LOTERÍA ESTATAL. Establece una lotería operada por el estado. Uso de los ingresos, premios, el 50%; gastos, no más del 16%; educación pública, por lo menos el 34%. Impacto fiscal: No puede ser próspero con certeza. El rendimiento que se calcula para la educación pública será de alrededor de $500 millones anuales, siendo menor los dos primeros años. División que se calcula: Jardín de Infantes al 12º grado, el 50%; universidades de la comunidad, el 13%; Universidad Estatal de California, el 5%; Universidad de California, el 2%.

MATERIALES DE VOTACIÓN. INGLÉS SOLAMENTE. Requiere que el Gobernador urja a los oficiales federales a que enmienden la ley para que los materiales para votación sean impresos en inglés solamente. Impacto fiscal: Insignificante.
### REAPPORTIONMENT
Provides reapportioning Senate, Assembly, Congressional, Equalization districts for 1986 and subsequent elections by new commission composed of former justices. Fiscal Impact: Commission costs of up to $3.5 million before 1986 election. Costs of $10,000 to $20,000 each to relocate an unknown number of district legislative offices. County costs of about $500,000 for 1986 election materials. County savings of about $300,000 in 1986 for printing costs, and $200,000 every two years thereafter. Future reapportionments will probably cost less than under existing law.

| 39 | YES 237 | NO 238 |

### CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS
Limits contributors and contributions to elective state office candidates. Opposition candidate’s personal expenditures matched by limited public funding. Fiscal Impact: Reduce state revenues by about $100,000 each fiscal year and increase state expenditures by approximately up to $1,650,000 each fiscal year.

| 40 | YES 242 | NO 243 |

### PUBLIC AID, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
Creates Public Assistance Commission. Limits benefit expenditures to national average plus 10%. Legislative amendments permitted. Fiscal Impact: Net effect would be combined state and county expenditure reduction beginning July 1, 1986. Size of reduction and impact at different levels of government impossible to determine. Substantial reductions under specified programs would be partially offset to an unknown extent by increased costs under other programs and reduced tax revenues resulting from reduced federal expenditures within the state. Likely, state expenditures would be reduced and county expenditures increased.

| 41 | YES 247 | NO 248 |

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

#### A
Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

| YES 253 | NO 254 |

#### B
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

| YES 256 | NO 257 |

#### C
Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

| YES 259 | NO 260 |
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIÓN GENERAL, 6 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1984

REDISTRIBUCIÓN. Dispone redistribución para los distritos del Senado, Asamblea, Congreso y de la Junta de Revisión de Avalúos para 1988 y para las elecciones subsiguientes mediante nueva comisión compuesta de antiguos jueces. Impacto fiscal: Costos de la comisión de hasta $3.5 millones antes de la elección de 1988. Costos de $10,000 a $20,000 cada uno para reubicar un número desconocido de oficinas legislativas en los distritos. Costos del condado alrededor de $500,000 para materiales para la elección de 1988. Horarios para el condado alrededor de $300,000 en 1988 por costos de impresión y $200,000 cada dos años de allí en adelante. Las redistribuciones futuras probablemente costarán menos que bajo la ley actual.

CONTRIBUCIONES PARA COMPAÑÍAS. Limita a los contribuyentes y las contribuciones a candidatos a cargos polítics efectivos, iguala con fondos públicos limitados los gastos personales del candidato de oposición. Impacto fiscal: Reduce los ingresos estatales en unos $100,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal y aumenta los gastos estatales en aproximadamente hasta $1,650,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal.

AYUDA PÚBLICA, PROGRAMAS DE ASISTENCIA MÉDICA. Crea Comisión de Asistencia Pública. Limita gastos de beneficios al promedio nacional más el 10%. Permite enmiendas legislativas. Impacto fiscal: el efecto neto sería la reducción de los gastos combinados del estado y condados comenzando el 1 de julio de 1988. El tamaño de la reducción y su impacto en los diferentes niveles del gobierno es imposible determinarse en este momento. Reducciones sustanciales bajo Programas especificados serían parcialmente compensadas hasta un grado desconocido mediante el aumento de gastos bajo otros programas y por ingresos de impuestos reducidos que resulten de gastos federales reducidos dentro del estado. Es factible que los gastos estatales serían reducidos y que los gastos de condados aumentarían.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

A. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión del Puerto a emitir $42,500,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la construcción y mejoras de las instalaciones portuarias?

B. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir $104,000,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones para el Departamento de Aguas?

C. ¿Deberá crearse una Comisión de Salud que consista de siete miembros nombrados por el Alcalde para dirigir y controlar los hospitales de la Ciudad y el Condado, y los demás servicios de salud del Condado, y para nombrar un Director de Salud Pública?

Ayuntamiento, 1988-1989:
- Prop. A: $21,708,000
- Prop. B: $100,900,000
- Prop. C: $910,000

Total: $213,518,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop.</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop.</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $213,518,000
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?</td>
<td><strong>YES 261</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 262</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?</td>
<td><strong>YES 264</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 265</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?</td>
<td><strong>YES 267</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 268</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?</td>
<td><strong>YES 270</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 271</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?</td>
<td><strong>YES 274</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 275</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?</td>
<td><strong>YES 278</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 279</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and Black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?</td>
<td><strong>YES 283</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 284</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.º</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Jubilaciones a hacer inversiones de los fondos de jubilación como persona prudente en lugar de hacer inversiones de carácter legal para compañías de seguros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Ciudad subvencionar al cónyuge sobreviviente de empleados activos o retirados de la misma manera que la Ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o retirados en el Sistema de Servicios de la Salud?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagar un beneficio de doce meses de salario por fallecimiento a diversos oficiales y empleados que mueren como resultado de lesiones físicas externas y violentas durante el transcurso y período de empleo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá el periodo probatorio para oficiales de policía extenderse de un año a partir de su entrada a un año después de haber completado el entrenamiento pero sin exceder ochenta y cuatro semanas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagar un salario adicional a los miembros del Departamento de Policía asignados a prestar servicio en todas las motocicletas de dos ruedas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>(Ordenanza de Iniciativa): Deberá San Francisco solicitar al Gobierno Federal que pague a los contribuyentes de impuestos si desean que una parte de sus impuestos se use para un excesivo gasto militar y si desean que la Ciudad publique un informe anual sobre los impuestos federales recaudados en San Francisco y sobre la parte usada para propósitos militares excesivos y la parte usada para necesidades sociales?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>(Declaración de Norma): ¿Deberá ser la norma de San Francisco que ningún fondo de pensión administrado por la Ciudad sea invertido en empresas que tienen intereses comerciales en Sudáfrica hasta que sea abolida la segregación racial y se otorgue a la población de raza negra plenos derechos políticos y civiles en Sudáfrica?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

STEP 1

Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.

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

STEP 2

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

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta 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 voto y perfore con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

STEP 4

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 9, 1984.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election, such as this one, you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot.

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

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature, Supervisors, B.A.R.T., College Governing Board and Board of Education.

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

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

Q—When do I vote?
A—the election will be Tuesday, November 6, 1984.
Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 6, 1984.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

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

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 25 through 41 because in June the numbers were 16 through 24.

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

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

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

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

BONDS—Contracts to borrow and repay money.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
"IT APPEARS TO BE ONE END OF THE NOVEMBER 7 SAN FRANCISCO BALLOT..."

Reprinted by permission of the San Francisco Chronicle.

(Because there are no BART candidates in your district this page would otherwise have been blank.)
JOHN SALEH ABDULLA
My address is 2533 Folsom Street
My occupation is Licensed Real Estate Salesman
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: I graduated at a local public high school. I also attended private business schools. I am presently a licensed real estate salesman.

Knowing the city's acute housing and employment problems, I am deeply concerned of the these problems and would like to be in a position to find solutions to these problems. While I have no immediate solutions; if elected, I promise the people of San Francisco that I will devote all of my time to finding solutions to these problems by utilizing all resources available to public officials in solving these problems.

John Saleh Abdulla

The sponsors for John Saleh Abdulla are:
Saleh M. Abdulla, 155 Clipper St., Janitor
Sam Bachman, 238 Eddy St., Janitor
Richard F. Bourdon, 163 Clipper St., Mover
Peter Bury, 555 Post St., Musician
Freddie Cononico, 1419 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Alfred Catalin, 1459 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Bernard Fabreo, 3609-11th St., Deputy Clerk
Robert Fulgham, 487 Noo St., Business Representative
Saleh M. Ghanem, 155 Clipper St., Maintenance
Stephen A. Halbe, 1202-23rd Ave., Musician
Jamal Jawad, 488 Ellis St., Business Owner
Zelma Ann Johnston, 575 O'Farrell St., Retired
Barbara D. Jones, 1421 South Van Ness Ave., Housewife
Alfred E. Kelly, 610 Polk St., Retired Union Official
Yhsa S. Mohamed, 640 Eddy St., Maintenance
Brian Charles Percy, 533 Hyde St., Payroll clerk
Charles Ridgell, 347 Lexington St., Business Representative, Janitors Union
James Roy Sellers, 575 O'Farrell St., Unemployed
Madeline Smith, 159 Clipper St., Housewife
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect

SUZANNE ALBERTO
My address is 25 Pinto Avenue
My occupation is Administrative Secretary
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I am a Hispanic-Filipina (English/Spanish-speaking) administrative-secretarial San Francisco worker and Muni commuter and have been a resident voter since 1968.

I believe San Franciscans would be better served if suitable inquiry and evaluation preceded passage of locally needed and desired legislation and tax revenue expenditures to assure anticipated results. San Francisco's Charter permits supervisory inquiry into expenditures. I strongly support thoroughly researched legislation and tax revenue use to benefit the peoples of San Francisco.

All of my sponsors know me to be a capable, persistent fighter for principles and public benefit and believe I would be an excellent supervisor.

Suzanne Alberto

The sponsors for Suzanne Alberto are:
L. J. Alberto, 4156-25th St., Communication Technician
Alvin E. Bernstein, 6 Roanoke St., Computer Analyst
David Carlton Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Tape Librarian
Sarah M. Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Programmer/analyst
Rose Violet Descio, 215 Niagara Ave., Retired Bookkeeper
Deirdra D. Dunlap, 125 DeMontfort Ave., Telecom Specialist
R. L. Feather, 111 Inverness St., Secretary
Angel Fernandez, Jr., 1419-11th Ave., Security Officer
David L. Forks, 26 Shields St., Janitor
Paul F. Garm, 2387-44th Ave., Security Guard
Joyce A. Glynn, 38 Serrano Dr., Legal Secretary
Margery M. Gray-Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Financial Administrator
Amy J. Kochler, 2006 Fell St., Office Manager
Cheryl Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Housewife
Cheryenne Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Welder
David Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Truck Driver
Ruth Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Housewife
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St., Custodian
Dewey W. McNeil, 251 Tophana Ave., Utility Engineer
Leon Medina, 1723 Church St., Retired-Laborer
Nathan Nemor, 125 Cam Don Dr., Retired-Produce Buyer
Patricia J. Powell, 2006 Fell St., Publishing
Petty Randall, 366 Wilde St., Grocery Clerk
Roberto Sampora, 324 Staples Ave., St. Drafter
Clifford C. Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Mechanic
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Clerical
E. L. Thomason, 111 Inverness St., Student
Kenneth E. Tucker, Jr., 243 Hahn St., Building and Grounds Patrolman

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

ROGER BOSCHETTI
My address is 20 Carnelian Way
My occupation is Television Producer, Host, Writer, and Labor Consultant
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of involvement with working men, women, and young people, and as a concerned citizen, I will work to implement laws which will benefit all the people of San Francisco, such as reducing payroll and business tax, so as to encourage small businesses to come or stay in San Francisco, thereby creating more jobs. Will implement constructive changes in muni for speedier, safer and effective service, I will also create better programs to help the needs of our young men and women, I would like more police foot patrol, and more affordable housing, with more concern for our senior citizen

Roger Boschetti

RICHARD BRADLEY
My address is 1 Ardath Court
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As a supporter of the Spartacist League I twice tore down the Confederate flag of slavery which flies no more in Civic Center. The American Civil War did not complete its historic mission. It will take a third American revolution, a socialist revolution, to liberate black people.

Spike Reagan's anti-Soviet war plans and union-busting austerity drive by mass strike action! U.S. imperialism—hands off Central America! Smash Klan/Nazi terror through labor/black action! Break with Democrats—enemies of labor/minorities! Build a workers party that will stop at nothing short of socialist revolution and a workers government!

Richard Bradley

The sponsors for Roger Boschetti are:
William A. Arietta, 16 Wheat St., Police Officer
Rita M. Bell, 1958 Greenwich St., Assessment Clerk
Rachel Boschetti, 20 Carnelian St., Cosmetologist
George Contessi-Turner, 531 O'Farrell St., Instructor/Professor
Bernard M. Crotty, 2971-23rd Ave., City Administrator
John E. Downey, 83 Gaviota Way, Nationally Known Referee/Limo Driver/Boxing Judge
Curtis Elliott, 350 Glenview Dr., Doorman
Evelyn C. Fitzgerald, 230 Storace St., School Administrator
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Dr., Labor Consultant.
Robert Jacobs, 1438-38th Ave., Business Agent
Roger Micheli, 2653 Chestnut St., Goldengate Disposal
Robert T. Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Lieutenant S.F.P.D. Retired
Shirley Robin Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Investigator
Marie G. Nielson, 319 Maynard St., Businesswoman
Marie Ann Perri, 80 Malta St., Corporate Secretary
Joseph J. Phillips, 1203 Clayton St., Attorney
John E. Ricci, 1324 Broadway, Lawyer
Don L. Rotan, 134 Gilbert St., Writer
Samuel Smith, 297 Allison St., Seaman Cook
Carmen Solis, 39 Majestic Ave., Restaurant Owner
Rose M. Tarantino, 160 Country Club Dr., Housewife
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
John J. Vidal, Sr., 1437 Judah St., Office Manager
Winston Wong, 225 Anzavista Ave., Manager of American Cab Co.
Herman W. Young, 210 Brookdale Ave., Seaman
Maya Dhillon-Zygi, 455 Chercy St., Homemaker

The sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellis, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephan C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 2659 Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikegami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolton, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Denisea Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

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

HARRY BRITT

My address is 783A Guerrero Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: As a full-time Supervisor, I’ve worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making city government respond to our needs.
• I’ve supported crime-reducing neighborhood patrols to protect seniors;
• fought to repeal the sewer service charge;
• worked to protect the quality of our neighborhoods and environment;
• secured funding for anti-gay violence programs, AIDS prevention, community arts programs;
• sponsored protections for renters and small businesses from skyrocketing rents;
• worked to create affordable housing;
• sponsored equal pay for comparable jobs;
• worked to have downtown pay its share of taxes;
• worked to save jobs when companies moved from San Francisco.

Harry G. Britt

The sponsors for Harry G. Britt are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 657 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman
John L. Molinaro, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris Ward, 440 Davis St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister, Community College Board Member
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Member, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Thelma Shelley, 70 Eton St., Performing Arts Administrator
Yori Wada, 365-4th Ave., Regent-University of California
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner,
Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., President, Harvey Milk Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., President, Alice B. Toklas Club
Wayne Friday, 1095-14th St., Newspaper Political Editor
Tom Murray, 4715 Balboa St., Newspaper Editor
Thomas F. Waddell, M.D. 141 Alibon St., Athletic Games Organizer
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Affordable Housing/Tenant’s Rights Worker
Edward L. Pest, 350 Arbolito Dr., Senior Citizen’s Advocate
John Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Sierra Club
Louise Ogden, 1674 Fillbert St., President, National Women’s
Political Caucus
Leon Bruschea, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Howard Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Andrea Jeffson, 1334 Mission Ave., Nuclear Freeze Leader
Philip E. De Andrade, 601 Mississippi St., Small Business Owner
Georgiana Lynn, 163 El Verno St., West Portal Avenue
Business Owner
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon St., Registered Nurse

RANDALL DWAYNE BRONNER

My address is 1390 Market Street
My occupation is artist-musician
My age is 30

My qualifications for office are: San Francisco Budget Surplus-$162 Million.
• Muni Fare/Fast Pass Revenue-$46 Million.
• Aspen, Colorado-Free buses ten years.
• Portland-Free buses downtown.

We residents pay for more than two thirds of Muni’s cost in our taxes. Residents should ride Muni for free!
You must check out the murals supporting Peace in Central America on Balmy Street.
Please call 864-8641 if you’d like to meet the survivors of 1906, free, at the Great Earthquake Exposition.
If you want to brighten up your street call San Francisco Street Gardeners for free cuttings, succulents, and flowers, at the same number.

Randall Bronner

The sponsors for Randall Bronner are:
Selig R. Raphael, 495-32nd Ave., Survivor 1906 Quake
Jane Dornacker, 9 Central Ave., Reporter
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
William T. Witter, 948 Haight St., Artist
James T. Lyon, 1761 Page St., Musician
F. Kelly Harris, 119 Lafayette Ave., Cateress
Julie Taneil, 1653 Washington St., Waitress
Raymundo E. Perin, 1470 Fulton St., Waiter
Mary L. Martinez, 295 Moscow St., Secretary
Sandra Renzi, 861 Post St., Waitress and Prep Work
Giorgio Irving, 1390 Market St., Waiter
Martin James, 1139 Broadway Bartender
Elizabeth Kelly, 3249 Pierce St., Restaurant Services
Anthony R., Parnello, 312 Precita Ave., Artist
Carlos Gonzalez, 3409-20th St., Community Worker
Robert Burnside, 2548 Folsom St., Carpenter
Susan Cervantes, 398 Precita St., Artist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
James A. Lewis, 2020 Cabrillo St., Artist/Teacher
Julianne Malaveaux, 26 Wilfield St., Economist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JONATHAN BULKLEY

My address is 147 Tenth Avenue
My occupation is Architect, Neighborhood Planner
My age is 54
My qualifications for office are: Experienced Architect and Planner. President, Planning Association for the Richmond; Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. Member: Open Space Committee, Mayor’s Task Forces for Parking, Mechanical Amusement Devices and Sidewalk Displays.

My Architecture / Planning background will help me respond to the need for a coherent vision of San Francisco as a City that works for everyone.

My priorities include:
• Housing for those most in need—singles, working women, seniors.
• Crime-free streets
• Civil service preference for San Francisco residents.
• Caring solutions to seniors’ needs.
• Eliminating Bay pollution.
• Maintaining Neighborhood Character, Diversity, and Liveability.

The interests of San Francisco Residents will always come first!

Jonathan Bulkley

The sponsors for Jonathan Bulkley are:
Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Tenant Representative, Rent Stabilization Board
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., S.F. Housing Commissioner
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Ter., Former City Planning Commissioner
Lee Dobson, 1755 Beach St., Professor; Former Supervisor
Jose Luis Fernandini, 464-43rd Ave., Businessman; Vice President, MAPA
Russell B. Flynn, 2610 Filbert St., President, Rent Stabilization Board
Ann Fogelberg, 2980 Vallejo St., Housewife; Vice Pres., Cow Hollow Association
Terry Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney; Former Supervisor
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Public Utilities Commissioner
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer
Ruth Gravanis, 74 Mizpah St., Glen Park Association
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Port Commissioner; Past President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
John Hooper, 201 Buena Vista East, Conservationist; President, Buena Vista Neighborhood Ass’n.
Don Horany, 84 Kelloch Ave., Former Supervisor
John H. Kirkwood, 1635 Green St., Member, BART Board
Bill Kuhn, 4215-26th St., Co-Chair, Open Space Committee
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner
Richard Livingston, 380 Eddy St., Administrator, Realty House
West; Member, Open Space Committee
Peter McCrea, 1024 Lake St., Businessman; Past Pres., Public Utilities Comm
Amy Meyer, 3627 Clement St., Rec. & Park Commissioner
William F. O’Keefe, Sr., 444 Corbett Ave., President, S.F. Taxpayers Association
Thomas R. Peretti, 3787-16th St., Banker; President, C.R.I.R., Alan Raznick, 237 Topaz Way, Attorney; President, Coalition for S.F. Neighborhoods
Toby Rosenblatt, 3409 Pacific Ave., Businessman; Pres., City Planning Commission
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
Sam Valentino, 500 College Ave., Retired; Past President St. Mary’s Park Improvement Club

DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I am a supporter of the Spartacists, the labor/socialists who put a stop to flying the Confederate flag, banner of KKK racism and slavery, in Civic Center. Finish the Civil War! Forward to a workers government!

Without socialist revolution catastrophe threatens mankind. We need an integrated workers party that will take the productive wealth from the capitalist bosses, and establish a workers government and socialist planned economy.

Spike Reagan reaction through mass strikes! Military victory to Salvadoran leftists! Defend the USSR! No support to Democrats—liberal party of imperialism! Smash Taft-Hartley! Labor’s gotta play hardball to win!

Diana Coleman

The sponsors for Diana Coleman are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Richard Bradley, 1 Ardash Ct., Maintenance Building
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikegami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennise Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomens, 1814A Church St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ELEANOR M. DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Accounting Services
My qualifications for office are: My experience with community groups and City Hall is extensive.

Involved in local politics through neighborhood and merchant associations, worked on campaigns for Diane Feinstein, and many others. Served the community through the following organizations: Vice President, Clement Merchants, head of legislative committee; Consultant to Polk Merchants; Member, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Roundtable, Vice Chair Health Committee; Board, California Alcohol Treatment Services; Chairperson Alcohol Awareness; Appointee, Mayor’s Task Force on Sidewalk Vending, Parking; San Francisco Outlook, Project Manager; Member, SPUR; Boardmember Public Research Institute, SFSU.

A loyal devotee of San Francisco. I will serve honestly with an open mind and heart.

Eleanor M. Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor M. Davis are:

Ronald Atkinson, 2322-25th Ave., Teacher
Robert R. Bacel, 4545-50th Ave., Attorney at Law
Rachael Balyeat, 2322 Hyde St., Investor
Luis A. Belmonte, 250 Walnut St., Real Estate Developer
Mildred Burrell, 2970 Pine St., General Contractor
Leslie A. Burton, 1758 Baker St., Attorney
Rose Cassano, 963 Carolina St., Artist
Tony DeLacorte, 1025 Hayes St., Public Relations Executive
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Deming St., Registered Nurse
John Richard Doyle, 105-12th Ave., Attorney at Law
Adrien Belli Falk, 1000 Green St., Housewife
Rory A. Flood, 1070 Revere St., Owner, Furniture Company
Patricia Hooper, 382 Arkansas St., Writer
Walter G. Jaffe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman and Library Commissioner
Paul Raynor Keating, 180-4th Ave., Attorney at Law
Dennis E. Kirtley, 1364 Larkin St., Manager of Gift Shop
Beatrice Kushner, 33 Presidio Terr., Attorney at Law
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Ted R. Moulton, 17 Leroy Pl., Architect
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Owner, Data Processing Company
Kenneth E. Rowell, 1319-5th Ave., Engineer
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Liquor Store Owner and Chairman of Parking Authority
Robert L. Strauss, 1754-9th Ave., Graduate Student
Debbie Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner
Larry Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner

EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES

My address is 695 John Muir Drive
My occupation is Banker
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Forty-four years after my grandparents were married here in San Francisco just seven months after the nineteen hundred and six earthquake. A beautiful blond hair, blue eyed baby boy came bouncing out of St. Joseph’s Hospital. Studying economics at St. Mary’s College after attending Riordan and then leaving religious life to create a conservation newspaper. Trying to educate local residents about the serious problems that we faced here in San Francisco and the bay area. If allowed to fulfill my dreams of what we can accomplish I will gladly give twenty-five per cent of my salary to charity.

Edward Michael Hayes

The sponsors for Edward Michael Hayes are:

Edwin B. Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Miriam Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Agnes Cassidy, 383 Day St., Retired
Anna M. d’Ottilet, 1356 Dolores St., Housewife
Bertram J. d’Ottilet, 1356 Dolores St., Retired
Mary M. Driscoll, 342-28th St., Administrative Assistant
John L. Flynn, 54 Seaview Terr., Banker
Elaine M. Gilligan, 133 Randall St., Banker
Rae Grubstick, 2479-40th Ave., Banker
Marcia Kocel, 44 Mallorca Way, Bank Clerk
Bernece Langley, 460 Duncan St., Retired
Bernadine K. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William G. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William D. MacGirffy, 2730-35th Ave., Banker
Michael J. McCarthy, 3744-22nd St., Retired
Nora S. McMahan, 456 Duncan St., Retired
Ellen McSweeney, 457 Duncan St., Retired
Aileen P. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Mary C. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Leona P. Parker, 36 Harper St., Housewife
James L. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Clerk
Janet M. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Secretary
Rita M. Phipps, 230 Prospect Av., Retired
Eugene F. Sullivan, 456 Duncan St., Ironworker
Catherine C. Tassone, 1798 Sanchez St., Clerk
Nellie Tomame, 1325 Church St., Home-maker
Seymour Whitewall, 3150 Clay St., Investment Broker
Ann M. Willis, 1365 Dolores St., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT DANIEL INGRAHAM
My address is 1637 Noriega Street
My occupation is Political Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Over one hundred years ago two great men, David Broderick and Edward Baker, gave their lives to save this Republic.

I ask you voters to compare these two San Franciscans with the small minded politicians of today.

Pathetic Wendy Nelder says “Fluoride causes AIDS”; degraded Willie Brown corrupts us with “Oh What a Night” bacchawlia; Feinstein lusts for higher office, and the rest are worse.

San Francisco can play an historic role in the development of the Pacific Basin. But you, our citizens, must decide. I urge you: Join with me and other candidates of Lyndon LaRouche’s NDPC in our fight.

Robert Daniel Ingraham

The sponsors for Robert Ingraham are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belish, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Forklift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea A. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Businessman
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16h Ave.; Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
Clita Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2264-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

RUBY T. JIMENEZ
My address is 961 Delano Avenue
My occupation is Directory Sales Representative
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: A San Francisco resident since, 1948 and a naturalized American of Mexican decent, I consider myself an earnest interpreter of human needs for the Hispanic community and other minorities. Misinterpretations, injustices, lack of communication and mutual respect must be addressed and aired. These human needs for minorities and others can be solved if we end the current world depression. The humane world economic policies of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly his proposal for joint economic development between the United States and Ibero-America (Operation Juarez) can end this depression. The port of San Francisco should be expanded to become a strong world trade center.

Ruby T. Jimenez

The sponsors for Ruby T. Jimenez are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Stanley J. Bolinski, 1909 Eddy St., Staff Clerk
Willa W. Coleman, 215 Manich St., Sales Representative
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
Patricia L. Hardy, 178 Broad St., Assistant Manager
Patricia Helton, 93 Prentiss St., Teacher, Mission Community College
Andrea Konviser Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Oral Lee Jones, 359 Orizaba Ave., Staff Clerk
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16h Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
Ruth Matias, 638 Sawyer St., Office Clerk
Patricia McDonagh, 385-28th St., Housewife
Thomas McDonagh, 385-28th St., Construction
Ruth E. Rosenberg, 165 Parnassus Ave., Instructor
Keith F. Skelly, 1909 Eddy St., Asst. Staff Mgr.
Leticia Wicklersham, 171 Preclita Ave.
Lupe D. Zamudio, 274 Broad St., Sales Representative

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ANDREW ("DADDY ANDY") JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Criminology Student
My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I have been a respected citizen and server of San Francisco for 25 years. I'm involved in many community organizations that care for our community such as Glide church, Red Cross volunteers and the Singel parents resource center. I've been appointed to sit on the board of such organizations as "Mission Coalition, Mission Model Neighborhood and the Mission Education program, (appointed by Major Alioto and Mayor Moscone). I'd like to dedicate my Supervisory campaign to a few of the many people who helped me over the years, Chef Roy Hammerich, Betty Romenoff and the Mission Childcare Consortium.

Andrew Daddy Andy Jones

WILLIE B. KENNEDY

My address is 950 Duncan Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: In my three years as Supervisor, I have worked to maintain and improve the unique quality of life we have in San Francisco—from rent control to fighting for parks and open spaces. I honor our rich diversity of cultures and life styles through support of neighborhood preservation and the rights of all groups—from children to seniors.

I initiated a campaign to control the tragic increase in child abuse; and am working hard on the problem of decreased employment, particularly for youth.

I want to continue serving your interests in making this the most liveable city in the United States.

Willie B. Kennedy

The sponsors for Willie B. Kennedy are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Elected Official, Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Shatt Blvd., Member of Congress
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor/Airport Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gutes St., Attorney At Law
Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guererro St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Agripino R. Ceballos, 471 Hoffman St., Member, Board of Education
Handy Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant, Commissioner PUC
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
James C. Horman, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
LeRoy King, 75 Tampa Ln., Union Official
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Aldo P. Lier, 1177 California St., Electrical Contractor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nobhill St., Philanthropist
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
James McCrory, Jr., 164-6th Ave., Minister
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
Adolph Schuman, 1170 Sacramento St., Businessman
Stan Smith, 315 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Yori Wada, 565-5th Ave., U.C. Regent
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hil Dirus St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 121 Golden Gate Avenue
My occupation is Musician
My qualifications for office are: I am one of many in unity with San Francisco’s diversity. I “Keyes” will open doors for you, to: homes, jobs, health care, better schools, provide more: complimentary fine arts, concerts, veterans benefits, senior services; close doors on pornography, drugs and prostitution; clean our streets and make them safe once more; eliminate wasteful spending and lower your taxes. For reasons like these, I am your “Keyes”. Never again, will any San Franciscan go wanting, while “special interest” lick their fingers. Let us shine bright, the city that knows how, a guiding light to world peace now.

God help us.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:
Gary Gene Adams, 139-5th Ave., Plastic Fabricator
Wayne Austin, 391 Leavenworth St., Job Developer
Brian Chew, 334-30th Ave., Restaurant Worker
Ginger Coyote Coleman, 734 Bush St., Editor of Funk Globe
Hugh T. Dauley, 1177 California St., Computer Operator
Thomas A. Finney, 165 Turk St., Disabled/SSI
Howard M. Grayson, 160 Eddy St., Community Coordinator,
Hosp. House
Louis J. Gwerder, 427 Valley St., Laborer
Mickey C. Helmel, 777 Tehama St., Patriot
John R. Hess, 554 Broadway St., Doorman
Kevin M. Kennedy, 250 McAllister St., Social Worker
Patricia E. Kerman, 1026 Montgomery St., Film Maker
John Lyman, 149-6th St., Musician
Patrick Marsh, 231-27th St., Chef
Perry V. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Teacher
Michelle Miller, 15 Surrey St., Student
David M. Moobs, 350 Frederick, Symphonic Musician
Keith F. Moog, 1233 Guerrero St., Contoller
Gary Posner, 443 Broadway St., Engineer
Steven Present, 573 Ellis St., Security Officer
Clark Sullivan, 765 Ellis St., Political Activist
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Office/Clerical
Robin Vega, 1330 Jessie St., Courier
H. Joseph Wagner, 121 Goldengate Ave., Musician
James E. Washington, Jr. 55 Mason St., Consultant, Arts and Science
Guy West, 640 Polk St., Broadcasting
Linda Marie White, 777 Tehama St., Seamstress

DAVID L. KILBER

My address is 1901 Noriega Street
My occupation is Management Consultant
My age is 40
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of Oregon State University, a Vietnam Veteran, and a former candidate for California State Assembly. I have resided in the Sunset district with my wife Susan for five years.

I stand for a strong defense policy including the Beam Weapon anti-missile defense and the technology boom this new “Apollo” program will bring to the local economy.

San Francisco must become a center for science, classical culture, and trade, bringing blue-collar families and industry back to this city. We must expand the Port of San Francisco and launch the Pacific Basin development strategy proposed by economist Lyndon LaRouche.

David L. Kilber

The sponsors for David L. Kilber are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Bell, 3256 Palos St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortiht Operator
Michael Frinio, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elmora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lecasno, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staminec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vezazitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
Edith Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retired
J.G. Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retailer

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
QUENTIN L. KOPP

My address is 68 Country Club Drive
My occupation is Attorney/Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: Local government is us, because we depend upon it to provide essential services and wise leadership. For 13 years I’ve fought to cut governmental waste and excessive taxation, to keep government honest and on its toes. My efforts have already saved taxpayers over $250,000,000 and I’m proud to be the one supervisor who watches how every dollar is spent. This year City government will spend an average $4,500,000 a day, every day. I want to continue my role as your “financial watchdog” in City Hall and add a needed balance to the Board. I would very much appreciate your support.

Quentin L. Kopp

The sponsors for Quentin L. Kopp are:

Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Former Mayor
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Former Member of the Board of Supervisors
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Attorney at Law
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd, Member of Congress
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Businessperson
Robert C. Ellis, 469 Magellan Ave., Attorney at Law
George Evankovich, 1600-A Greenwich St., Labor Representative
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Jack E. Frankel, 72-22nd Ave., Rabbi
Merla Zellerbach Goerner, 225 Presidio Ter., Author/Journalist
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Attorney at Law
Carleton Goodlett, 2060 O’Farrell St., Publisher
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author/Retired Publisher
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonestreet Dr., Contractor
Golda Kaufman, 3900 Pacific Ave., Homemaker/Volunteer
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070-26th Ave., Congressional Assistant
Joseph P. Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
John Lo Schiavo, 2130 Fulton St., Priest/Educator
Hai G. Mardikian, 2960 Divisadero St., Businessman
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 2151-16th Ave., Retired President of City Employees

John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Harriet C. Salarino, 95 Crestlake Dr., Self Employed Businesswoman
Burk A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Police Commissioner
Dorothy Vekich, 177 San Aleso Ave., Housewife/Volunteer
Benney Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arbello Drive
My occupation is Political Scientist/Educator
My age is 29

My qualifications for office are: impressive. A full decade of political activism at national, state, and local levels. Leadership roles in labor, housing, and education. To illustrate my seriousness in leading our City, I have launched the following initiative campaigns:

* A 3-year rent freeze
* Commercial rent control
* A balanced budget
* Expedition of labor disputes
* Driver-ownership of taxicabs
* An outdoor stadium in front of Moscone Center

As your supervisor, I will pursue:

* District elections for district councils
* Metro services for the Richmond, Marina, Bayview
* Higher police standards
* More schools and parks

You need me now, San Francisco! Who else you gonna call?

Julian O. Lagos

The sponsors for Julian Lagos are:

Charles Martin Adams, 54 4th St., Cab Driver
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 577 Arbello Dr., Psychologist
Elizabeth Alvarez, 1252 La Playa St., Sales
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall St., Computer Consultant
Elizabeth Benford, 508 Andover St., Attorney
Katherine Bobrowski, 417 Stockton St., Unemployed
Thomas J. Callan, 17 Sutro Heights Blvd, Consultant
James D. Cantor, 742 Treat Ave., Station Attendant
Henry Conserva, 1258 40th Ave., Professor
Leon Datangel, 725 Van Ness Ave., Businessman
Peggy L. Dickson, 320 Monticello, Student
Mark Emery, 555 Taylor St., Artist
James Michael Faye, 1369-B Page St., Tenant Advocate
Philomena Higgins, 146 Fillmore St., Videographer
Ken Johnson, 42 Kellogg St., Cabdriver
Vincent B. L'atimer, 4118-A-24th St., Service Manager
Richard Loweinsohn, 1341 Valencia St., Writer
John B. Loret, 905 Columbus Ave., Cab Driver/Fisherman
Bernicee Martin, 306 Church St., Public Stenographer
Jonathan McCardy, 80 Alvarado St., Attorney
Victor E. Miller, 1341 Valencia St., Editor
Steven A. Scheckman, 1301 20th St., Attorney
William F. Taylor, 1890 Clay St., Operating Engineer
Frank S. Warner, 2300 Fillmore St., Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 249 Cotter St., Legal Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JULIANNE MALVEAUX
My address is 26 Winfield Street
My occupation is Economics Professor/Labor Specialist/Writer
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan and former White House staffer (1977-78). Dr. Julianne Malveaux (pronounced “Mal-Voh”) is an elected California State Central Committee woman who is committed to a diverse San Francisco:
—San Francisco Tomorrow Board Member
—Booker T. Washington/Ella Hill Hutch Board Member
—Strong Supporter: Mondale-Ferraro
—Steering Committee, San Francisco Plan Initiative
—Delegate candidate for Jesse Jackson
—Former staff, President’s Council of Economic Advisors
—Ph.D. (Economics, MIT)
—Co-author of three books
—Columnist, San Francisco Sun Reporter
—Priority focus: job creation programs for youth, minorities, and women
—Author, 1984 Ballot Proposition J which prohibits San Francisco pension fund investments in South Africa.

JOHN L. MOLINARI
My address is 30 16th Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: To make San Francisco work takes both good ideas and cooperation with everyone.
For over 12 years as your Supervisor, my contribution has been to bring together both the diverse viewpoints of San Francisco’s many communities and the other Supervisors to solve our City’s problems. With your support, I’ve:
—Promoted the construction of more housing; limited condominium conversions to protect renters; protected tenants from rent gougers and outrageous security deposits;
—Initiated escort services to protect seniors;
—Initiated preferential parking and parking ticket amnesty programs;
—Protected our neighborhood character from big companies forcing out small merchants; and
—Protected San Francisco’s parks and playgrounds.

The sponsors for Julianne Malveaux are:
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
Judith Breecka, 609 Kansas St., Lawyer, City Commissioner
Randall Bronner, 1390 Market St., Artist/Musician
Rene Cazeneuve, 2201-22nd St., Housing Advocacy
Terence Faulkner, 2371 42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Thomas C. Fleming, 2171 O‘Farrell St., Journalist
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Margaret A. Gamon, 3649-18th St., Attorney
Howard S. Gloyd, 550 Noriega St, Minister
Yvonne S. Golden, 1743-9th Ave., School Administrator
Peter M. Good, 709 Shadet Dr., Arborist
Roberto Y. Hernandez, 382 Moultrie St., Director, Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer
Doris W. Kahn, 3259 Clay St., Transportation Commissioner
Tony Kilroy, 471-11th Ave., President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Michael Koblentz, 825 Masonic Ave., Distributor
G relisa Langston, 55 Friendship Way, Senior and Geriatric Specialist
Arthur Lathan, 2350-48th Ave., Personnel Administrator
Michael C. Miller, 1920 Quint St., Attorney
Jack D. Morrison, 44 Woodland Ave., Management consultant
Carl Dario Reece, 2034-46th Ave., Graduate Student
Ruth Gordon Schnupp, 720-23rd Ave., Structural Engineer
Frances M. Shaskan, 259-32nd Ave., Consumer Rights Advocate
Anita Silvers, 15 Otsego St., Professor, S.F. State
Arlo Smith, 66 Fernandina Way, District Attorney
Bruce M. St Cyr, 543 Chester Ave., Vice President AFSCME Local 2620
Ida V. Strickland, 1664 Fulton St., Administrator
Calvin Welch, 519 Ashbury St., Community Consultant

The sponsors for John L. Molinari are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
John Francis Foran, 900 Rockdale Dr., State Senator
Art Agnos, 637 California St., Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Louise K. Molinari, 30 10th Ave., Homemaker/Media Producer
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunada Way, Pastor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Member, Public Utilities Commission

Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 550 Noriega St., Pastor
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Eloise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director, Patient Advocacy
Gordon J. Lau, 540 19th Ave., Member, Port Commission
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Duke J. Armstrong, 352 Divisadero St., Former President, C.R.I.R.
Paul Boneberg, 647-A Castro St., President, Stonewall Gay Political Club
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, Community United Against Violence
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter (B.A.R.)
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Member, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Political Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington Way, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Political Club
Maureen J. Connolly, 650 Eucalyptus Dr., Humemaker
John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Chair, Sierra Club Bay Chapter
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus
Michael S. Salamone, 95 Crestlake Dr., Sunset District Merchant

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PAT NORMAN
My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Senior Health Care Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I am a political progressive with extensive professional experience as an administrator, program consultant, mediator, and service provider. These skills and my perspective will be valuable additions to the Board.

My commitment to economic and social justice is backed by 25 years of community service to ethnic and cultural minorities, women, low- and moderate-income families, elders, youths, gay people, small businesses, workers, the disabled, and government policy-makers.

I support neighborhood preservation, affordable housing measures (including rent control), jobs and job training for San Franciscans, comparable worth, and environmental safeguards.

I am a parent and San Francisco homeowner. Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:
Priscilla Alexander, 745 Haight St., Feminist Activist
Zohn P. Arway, 141 Albion St., Media Consultant
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Executive Director, SF Renaissance
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing Manager
Diana Christensen, 86 Sanchez St., Executive Director, CUAV
Dennis M. Collins, 145-27th St., Political Consultant
Greg Day, 2260 Market St., Youth Services Director
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Attorney/Teacher
Walter R. Ems, 188 Eureka St., Retired
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 765 Geneva Ave., Confidential Secretary
Roma Gau, 583 Missouri St., Co-Director, The Women’s Foundation
Kenneth W. Jones, 600 Fillmore St., Office Manager; SF AIDS Foundation
Linda Jupiter, 2768-22nd St., Book Production Manager
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Senior Services Administration
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Jane McKuskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired Police Commissioner
Connie O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant, S.F. Sheriff’s Department
Juanita Owens, 371 Coleridge St., Educator/Administrator
Tith A. Pearlman, 464 Duboce Ave., Writer/Photographer
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Political Activist
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Union Representative
Marguerite Rubenstein, 46 Stillings Ave., Therapist
Stephen H. Walters, 1225 Diamond St., Fundraiser

JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS
My address is 1203 Clayton Street
My occupation is Executive (Probate Attorney)
My qualifications for office are: This is not New York. My grandfather worked for this city for thirty-six years; helping to make San Francisco the greatest place on earth in which to live. Now our city bus system has to go hat in hand to Los Angeles to borrow buses. The quality of care at our general hospital has come under extreme question. The city of love, tolerance, and understanding is becoming more and more divided by every hate on earth. I, as a fourth generation San Franciscan, call upon you to join with us natives in the fight to keep San Francisco San Francisco. Joseph James Phillips

The Sponsors for Joseph J. Phillips are:
Margaret Moskowitz Berzin, 2201 Lake St., Retired
Ernest Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
Amelia Sheehan, 436-27th Ave., Homemaker
Salvador Garza, 793 Brunswick St., Businessman
Gerald E. Gallagher, 2282-34th Ave., Retired
Jean M. McDermott, 325-9th Ave., Tax Preparer
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Juanita G Cardinelli, 1215-18th St., Retired
Peter G. Economou, 2840 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Laura Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Volunteer for Handicapped
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Consuelo G. MacDonald, 801-44th Ave., Retired
Roger Boschetti, 20 Carmelita St., Television Producer
Jody S. Hirota, 571-19th Ave., Dental Hygienist
Maurice C. Bihan, 111 Willard North St., Salesman
Kelly Lyon, 435-25th Ave., Secretary
Ralph A. Barsi, 1236 Athens St., Retired Teamster
Laura B. Campbell, 1275-32nd Ave., NOW
William E. Beyers, Jr, 3232 Geary Blvd, Printer
Pearle Wong, 1555 Shrader St., Housewife
Sophia E. Conley, 2845 Cabrillo St., Teacher
Jimmy Starr, 23 Boardman Pl., Lawyer
Hannah Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
John L. Santiago, 150 Woodland Ave., Retired
Walter J. Murphy, 767 Corbett Ave., Retired
Carl H. Hoppe, 100 Hamilton St., Retired
Jack I Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
Sam Kekustaine, 84 Lopez Ave., Self Employed
Helen Marie Sheehan, 878-36th Ave., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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LOUISE RENNE

My address is 3725 Jackson Street
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
My age is 47

My qualifications for office are: As Finance Committee chairperson I have protected vital services while cutting wasteful expenditures. Sound policies have been implemented. San Francisco is on solid financial footing.

At the same time I played a leadership role in legislation affecting the environment, health care, Muni, the arts, indeed all San Franciscans (including our seniors and children).

My prior experience includes Deputy Attorney General, Criminal and Environmental Units; argued cases in Supreme Court; President, California Women Lawyers.

As an effective Supervisor, I pledge to continue my hard work, to act responsibly and compassionately, and to speak honestly on the critical issues affecting all San Franciscans.

Louise Renne

The sponsors for Louise Renne are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman 16th District
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli St., Public Relations
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director—CYO—Urban Development
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Pres. Airport Commission
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadred St., Planning Commissioner
Harry G. Britt, 783A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rev. Ames C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Thomas J. Cahill, 246-17th Ave., Chief of Police, Retired
Lily Cuneo, 3819 Jackson St., Housewife
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Anne W. Haas, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President, Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Mattie J. Jackson, 324 Belvedere St., Vice President, ILGWU
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman/Commissioner
John S. Jennings, 2743 San Bruno Ave., Realtor (Ret.)
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director of ILGWU
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
Leslie M. Lawrence, 2423 Broadway, Certified Public Accountant
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner and Attorney
Melvin D. Lee, 450-22nd Ave., Engineer (Commissioner, S.F.
Redevelopment Agency)
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Cyril Magnin, One Nob Hill Cir., Philanthropist
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor, State of California
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Business Representative
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vieute St., Investment Advisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, SF Board of Supervisors
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CAROL RUTH SILVER

My address is 68 Ramona Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: Experience: Seven years a San Francisco Supervisor; twenty years a practicing attorney; mother of two.

—Responsiveness to neighborhoods:
My parking reform legislation will open up neighborhood parking spaces.

—Advocate for fairness legislation:
—preserving sunlight in parks
—outlawing gay discrimination
—creating low and moderate income housing
—repairing City streets and buildings
—rent control
—protecting Chinatown merchants
—S.A.F.E. and Senior Escort Programs
—Neighborhood Arts Programs
—reducing smog
—preserving San Francisco Bay
—expanding Muni
—wheelchair accessibility
—more women and minorities receiving City contracts
—child care

I will continue to insist on fairness.

Carol Ruth Silver

The Sponsors for Carol Ruth Silver are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
George Agnos, 2131 Funston Ave., City Attorney
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., San Francisco Assemblyman
Richard D. Honigso, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 69 Elite St., San Francisco Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, 335 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., San Francisco Supervisor
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, President, Airport Commission
H. Welton Flynn, 77 Venus St., Public Utilities Commissioner
Emmett D. Condon, 2506-21st Ave.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Jule C. Anderson, 575-5th Ave., Education Specialist
Tim M. Dayonot, 645 Randolph St., Charity Media Specialist
Teresa E. Griffin, 839-41st Ave., Retired Teacher
Vivian Hallman, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired
Samuel Jordan, 4006-3rd St., Caterer
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Civil Engineer
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Education
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Seine Way, Attorney
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Realtor
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Business Representative
Jack Trujillo, 74 Ramona St., Word Processor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
DAVID C. SMITH

My address is 2567 Alemany Blvd
My occupation is Administrator, Service Agency
My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: I am a San Francisco State graduate in journalism, married, with a deep affection for this place. For seven years my wife and I have counseled families and individuals from every neighborhood in San Francisco—an investment and commitment to the future. Dealing with these problems has increased my awareness of this city’s growing preoccupation with rights and shrinking concern for responsibilities. The solution includes a return to basics, to strong family units, to solid values, to the worth of all human life. I will be a voice for those who feel excluded, especially exploited children and the disadvantaged.

David C. Smith

The sponsors for David C. Smith are:
James Bailey, Sr., 422 Guerrero St., Minister
Lillian P. Bailey, 422 Guerrero St., Housewife
Janis Ann Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Secretary
Jeffrey Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Photographer
Robert R. Carlson, 537 Baden St., Radio Producer
Victoria A. Carlyle, 1896 Octavia St., Political Analyst
John William Castro, 3 Plymouth St., Mover
John Frederick Decker, 1090 Eddy St., Designer
Frances Edwards, 2554 Alemany Blvd., Housewife
Daley Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., Homemaker
David Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., High School President
James W. Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Police Officer
Jean Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Housewife
James L. Higgins, 270 Juanita Way, Pastor
Margaret M. Lee, 730-12th Ave., Secretary
Mark W. Lee, 881 Silver Ave., President, Simpson College
Arvid Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Norma Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Secretary
Philip Litton, 3340 San Bruno Ave., Student
John A. McCuehan, 1230 LaPlaya St., Military, U.S. Army
Charles A. McLhenny, 1250 Lawton St., Clergy
J. Thad McKinney, 788 Kansas St., Station Manager
Marilyn G. Miller, 518 Dewey Blvd., Secretary
Chris Montgomery, 518 Dewey Blvd., Church Worker
Lawrence W. Pang, 254 Arch St., Environmental Health Inspector
James Douglas Robinson, 1319-7th Ave., Moving Company Manager
James W. Robinson, 518 Dewey Blvd., Executive Director of a Christian Service Organization
Conrad R. Sanchez, 1685 Octavia St., Restaurateur
Constance B. Steinbach, 180 Lippard Ave., Homemaker

KEVIN STARR

My address is 445 Chestnut Street
My occupation is Businessman, Communicator, Professor
My age is 44

My qualifications for office are: Born in San Francisco, I relish the past, present and future of this great city. I know it from a variety of perspectives—as executive aide to Mayor Alioto, as City Librarian, a newspaper columnist, as a professor, as a businessman, and as a person active in many civic causes. I now wish to bring my talents and experience to the Board of Supervisors. I believe I can be of unique service as the centrist advocate of this city as it looks to its future. That future, the well-being of each of us, will be my greatest concern.

Kevin Starr

The sponsors for Kevin Starr are:
Richard B. Allen, 2111 Franklin St., Merchant
Lynn A. Altshuler, 1490 Sacramento St., Attorney
Thomas E. Anderson, 256 Moncada Way, Clergyman
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Job Training Director
Gino Bindaelli, 700 Columbus Ave., Restaurateur
Sam Cambi, 265 San Anselmo Ave., Insurance Estate Planner
Frank J. Caufield, 1034 Chestnut St., Venture Capital Investor
Violet L. Chu, 1282 Vallejo St., Asian Art Commissioner
Elizabeth A. Cooley, 2820 Scott St., Legal Assistant
Paul Denning, 2165 California St., Investment Banker
Martin Eng, 665 Pine St., County Central Committee Member
James W. Haas, 163 Prospect Ave., Attorney
Patrick E. Hallinan, 117-27th Ave., Attorney
Walter E. Hoadley, 999 Green St., Economist
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Allan S. Johnson, 163 Prospect Ave., Consultant
Dorrin Buck Jones, 245 Northpoint St., Gerontologist; Director, Meals on Wheels
Harold K. Lipset, 2509 Pacific Ave., Private Investigator
Frances A. Lopez, 1474 Sacramento St., Paralegal
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Editor
John Maher, 795-8th Ave., Executive
Roxanne Mankin, 2312 Pacific Ave., Investment Real Estate
Michael Marston, 3375 Jackson St., Real Estate and Development Consultant
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave., Asst. Business Manager, Local #38
John N. Rosekrans, Jr, 2840 Broadway, Businessman, Toy Manufacturer
Michael S. Salamo, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Businessman
Michael Struksy, 2266 Bay St., Construction Executive
Brooks Walker, Jr., 2930 Broadway, Business Executive
Suzan Yee, 632-6th Ave., Attorney

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JOHN E. WAHL
My address is 118C Connecticut Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have a 20 year record of voluntary, unpaid public service to San Francisco. I have worked with all levels of City government, with people in all parts of the City. Examples of my public service include being a Judge Pro Tem of the San Francisco Municipal Court, 9 years of service on the Board of the San Francisco Council of Churches, service on the Pride Foundation Board, and service to veterans.
I am dedicated to ensuring affordable places to live, a responsible and unprejudiced police department, decent jobs, and dependable transportation.
I am independent of special interest club politics.

John E. Wahl

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN
My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is Staff-writer for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 58
My qualifications for office are: My program:
Courts, cops and strikebreaking injunctions; two-gate, two-tiered, union-busting tactics, are helping employers depress living standards. Escalating health, housing and food costs are forcing working people—especially Blacks and Latinos—out of San Francisco. Corporate condos and highrises replace workers’ residences.
Door-key children of working parents, denied childcare, are left to roam the streets. Abortion clinics are under siege.
Only united labor—employed, unemployed, black, white—can change this condition. An independent labor party, based on the unions, must be built to replace the callous politicians of the two ruling capitalist parties.
Jobs not war!

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for John F. Wahl are:
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, Community College Board
Caroline W. Marks, 55 Jordan Ave., Economist and Civic Leader
James E. Sandmire, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
E. Patricia L. Lucey, 69 Huntington Dr., Attorney
Benjamin L. Marcus, 84 Winfield St., Rabbi and Chaplain
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Walter W. Grumm, 3126-22nd St., Clergyperson
Ann Marie Day, 136 Delmar St., Retired Social Worker
Cleve Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Aide
Paul S. Yein, 342-9th Ave., Real Estate Agent
Hank Wilson, 1651 Market St., Hotel Operator
Fred L. Kurlander, 115 San Alco, Attorney
Jean Wall Burgess, 421 Moraga Ave., Lawyer
Gary E. Myerscough, 165 Sproule Ln., Education Administrator
Paula F. Lichtenberg, 925 Jones St., Paralegal
Paul D. Hardman, 782 Pacific Ave., Author, Retired Publisher
Jerry G. Guerra, 85 Fortuna St., Retailer
Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr., M.D. 2170 Hayes St., Physician
Foster W. Weeks, 1910 Greenwich St., Advertising Consultant
Shirley Kaiser, 806-33rd Ave., Teacher
Robert W. Shore, 146 Guerrero St., Businessman
Rosa M. Kwong, 512 Van Ness Ave., Law Student
Charlene Yamato, 416 Font Ave., Secretary
Jeanette Sibley, 25 Woodhaven Ct., Classroom Teacher
Alan Thompson Smith, 190 Palo Alto Ave., Small Business Owner
William Earl Andrews, 4130 Army St., Taxi Driver
Larry E. Hughes, 87 Fortuna St., Paralegal/Consultant
Julita V. DeChavez, 1591-45th Ave., Deputy County Clerk

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:
Alan A. Benjamin, 2783-20th St., Editor, Socialist Action
Paul Colvin, 558-36th Ave., Printer
Nancy G. Eino, 615 Central Ave., Teacher
Ralph P. Forsyth, 77 Cedro St., Teacher
May May Gung, 25 Besse St., Power Plant Operator
Nancy L. Gruber, 921 Alvarado St., Editor
Millie B. Gonzalez, 2543-32nd Ave., Student
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Longshoreman
Ruth Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Office Worker
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297-18th St., Retail Clerk
William G. Leumer, 535 Day St., Mechanic
Ann Menashe, 2149-40th Ave., Feminist Attorney
Linda L. Ray, 3740-25th St., Registered Nurse
Ann A. Robertson, 535 Day St., Professor
Joseph M. Ryan, 25 Besse St., Machinist
Karen A. Schieve, 575-19th St., Sales Clerk
Michael William Schreiber, 3593 Mission St., Muni Driver
Carole Sedgman, 245 Whitney St., Muni Bus Driver
Kathryn Sexton, 1364-16th Ave., Engineer
Margery Jean VanDyke, 1546-20th St., Registered Nurse
Christine Vaughn, 1255 Polk St., Poster or Clerk
David Walters, 2543-32nd Ave., Power Plant Operator
Bonnie Weinstein, 1716 Revere Ave., Student
Deborah Weinstein, 1830 Church St., Unemployed Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 489-27th St., Painter

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DAVE WHARTON
My address is 5031 Diamond Heights Blvd.
My occupation is Community Service Attorney
My age is 44
It's time for housing expansion, for transit, traffic, parking overhaul. Time for better City services, especially for seniors and youth. Time to strengthen economy, create jobs, control taxes. Time for neighborhood revitalization, parking relief. Time for human rights advancement, efficient and humane police services. Experiment with Board meetings in neighborhoods.
It's time for goals, results, citizen participation. San Francisco is world class city, small town; lose either, be neither. I build bridges, not barriers. Join our common sense coalition.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Libby Denney, 200 St Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Douglas Chan, 316 Spruce St., Attorney/Rent Board Commissioner
Jerry E. Berg, 115 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Russell Flynn, 2815 Pacific Ave., Real Estate/Rent Board Commissioner
Charles B. Renfrew, 791-14th Ave., Attorney/Former Federal Judge
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Hotel/Real Estate Executive
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Alice Wang, 1418 Leavenworth St., Educational Specialist
Mortimer Fleishhacker, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Investor
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
Diane C. Kefauver, 1726 Great Highway, Consultant
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Union President/Retired
Jose Gomez, 59 Grandview Ave., Legal Services/Executive Director
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
John L. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Insurance/Savings and Loan Chairman
Phyllis Kern, 306 Arbor St., Labor Union Secretary
Russell I. Kassman, 2454 Bush St., Businessman
Laura E. McBride, 925 Cole St., Typographer
George M. Raya, 90 Yerba Ct., City Employee
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Development Executive
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Agent
Lawrence A. Wilson, 333-A Pierce St., Attorney—Community Volunteer
Deborah R. Pines, 4248-20th St., Financial Consultant
John T. McAlester, Jr, 999 Green St., Businessman
Bobbie Griffith, 50 Leland Ave., District Attorney Investigator
Edith Wellin, 165-A Alpine Ter., Teacher

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DICK CERBATOS
My address is 471 Hoffman Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have always been deeply interested in the education of youth. Before my appointment to the Board of Education two years ago, I served twenty years on Citizens’ Advisory and PTA committees focusing on education. As an engineer business-owner, I also bring professional skills to the Board.

As a first generation American, I am sympathetic to minority children’s problems, and aware that public education is the golden gateway to opportunity and success.

I intend to continue pressing for higher test scores, improved discipline and morale, less truancy, and an increase in college admissions.

I am committed to excellence in education.

A. Richard Cerbatos

CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON
My address is 29 Oliver Street
My occupation is Transit Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I was born and raised in San Francisco, graduating from Balboa High.

For the past 7 years I have been active in the school district having been elected to 2 terms on the District Advisory Committee, 4 years as the chairperson of the Pelton Academic Middle School Parent’s Group, and 5 years on the site advisory council at Pelton.

I am married and have 2 children attending Commodore Sloat Elementary School.

I believe there is much work needed to provide the quality education our children need to prepare them for a highly technical society of computers and robotics.

Chris Christenson

The sponsors for Dick Cerbatos are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 657 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Lawyer
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Bovice, 234 Gates St., Attorney at Law
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director
Judy Dellamonica, 5323 Taraval St., President, San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
Jes T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President-Personnel
Michael Hennessy, 621 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Eugene S. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Physician
Thomas E. Hirtz, 950 Roedale Dr., Attorney
Ralph F. Hurd, 65 Newburg St., Executive Director
Marty J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Labor-Vice President, ILGWU
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir. ILGWU
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Bette Wallace Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Ct., Homemaker
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, S.F. Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolford, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The sponsors for Christopher Christenson are:
Essie L. Webb, 186 Maddox Ave., Intake & Referral Specialist
Raymond Tustall, 515 John Muir Dr., Deputy Sheriff
Francis Smyth, 1769-16th Ave., Deputy Sheriff
Harry E. Jensen, 72 Delmonte St., Electrical Transit Manager
Joe W. Turner, 1274 Palou Ave., Janitor Supervisor II
Martin Larkin, 4733 Lincoln Way, Paint Supervisor
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Supervisor II
Joseph Delia Rosa, 50 Oliver St., Seaman
Precious Moore, 2046 Thomas Ave., Home Health Aide
Liana Sand Dune Kastina, 524 Clipper St., Clerk Typist
William Satchell, 500 Francisco St., Transit Car Cleaner
Roy W. Haver, 576 Lisbon St., Marble Shopman
Guadalupe Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Jeanne L. Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Grocery Clerk
Roosevelt Lancaster, 170 Ledyard St., Transit Car Cleaner
Lena M. Quintana, 3331 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Alfred Lent, 1475 Church St., Electrical Mechanic
George Williams, Sr., 335 Hearst Ave., Retired
Beatrice L. Dunbar, 430 Thornton Ave., Retired
Vicente Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Driver
Gabriela, R. Wilkerson, 1347-15th Ave., Cashier

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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LIBBY DENEBEIM

My address is 200 St. Francis Blvd.
My occupation is Incumbent School Board Member
My qualifications for office are: Four years ago you elected me to the school board. I am deeply grateful.
I have worked hard. Student achievement scores improved, enrollment stabilized. We strengthened significantly special programs and alternative schools.
There remains much work to do. As a mother of six public school educated children, former teacher and experienced school board member, I know how our schools should work.
Many children today will finish school in the 21st Century. For all our children we must plan for the future, reaffirm our commitment to excellence, use school dollars prudently and ensure the momentum for improvement in our schools continues.

Libby Denebeim

The sponsors for Libby Denebeim are:
Robert S. Denebeim, 200 St Francis Blvd., Businessman
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Patricia F. Costello, 2838 Green St., Community Leader
Carota T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA Volunteer
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Thomas Haech, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Cynthia Brown Kelly, 460 Magellan St., Homemaker
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., Board of Education Member
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Gordon J. Lai, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan St., Lt. Governor
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Attorney/Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., Mental Health Director
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder, 150 Castas Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
Philip Bruce Raful, 962 Clayton St., SF Open Space Committee Member
Sal Roselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor/Gay Leader
Joan-Marie Shelley, 893 Burnett Ave., Teacher/President, SF Federation of Teachers
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Pamela Poncio Waller, 649 San Jose Ave., Contract Compliance Representative
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Malcolm S.M. Watts, 270 Seacrest Ave., Physician

GEORGE DYKSTRA

My address is 949 Filbert Street
My occupation is Community Services Director
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am trained in government finance and Citizen Participation decision making. Long community involvement includes director, Educational Services, Executive Board of Golden Gate Child Development, Saint Mary's Hospital Board and Yick Wo Elementary Parent's Committee. My education includes a B.A., emphasizing Education and U.S.C. graduate school.
I am practical, experienced and positive. I expect more from students, parents and teachers. I promise fiscal responsibility. I respect and support parent participation, teacher professionalism and every student's right to learn in well-equipped, orderly schools. Opportunity, Technology and Basics.
Vote for me! I will keep children in the picture.

George Dykstra

The sponsors for George Dykstra are:
Lisa Barford, M.D., 880 Sloat Blvd., Physician
Millicent E. Buxton, 80 Parnassus Ave., Educator
Robert T. Corrado, 181 Miramar Ave., Administrator
Teresa M. D'Auray, 75 Heather St., Environmental Fund Raising
Kathleen DePaola, 949 Filbert St., Psychologist
Kathleen Dykstra, 949 Filbert St., Legal Administrator
Linda J. Gaudreau, 858-26th Ave., Director of Medical Records
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Attorney-at-Law
Ann K. Howell-Ison, 904 Cortland Ave., Volunteer Coordinator
D. S. Inaba, 44 Escendonio Ave., Associate Professor
Martha Anne Jessup, 2562 Diamond St., Educator
Deborah L. Keller, 1466-41 Ave., Student
Katherine Lambert, 63 Winfield St., Women's Services Consultant
Ninu Landry, 1040 Cole St., Student
Nick Lechter, 79 Mipan St., Executive Director, Senior Services
Dr. Thomas S. McCoy, 1446 Clay St., Professor
Tim P. Mess, M.D,55 Lundys Ln., AIDS Clinician-Researcher
Susan L. Mok, 1332-38th Ave., Acupuncturist
Marcia Quackenbush, 1690-27th Ave., Social Worker
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director
CAHEED

Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Director of Health
Kenneth M. Sims, 1454 Palou Ave., Associate Director Child Development Center
David E. Smith, 80 Parnassus Ave., Physician
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Montecito St., Attorney
Michael Stepanian, 2109 Baker St., Attorney
Harvey W. Q. Tso, 70 Lomita Ave., Businessman
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilites, Methodist Minister
E. Leif Zerkin, 1326-26th Ave., Editor

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

My address is 665 Pine Street
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant
My qualifications for office are: Twelve years of community and civic service.

Issues
Eng supports:
• Our children's inherent right for education.
• Regain respect for our teachers.
• Strict measures to halt school violence. Stop the sale and use of street drugs.
• Higher standards for teachers and students.
• Encourage teachers and parents participation within the Board.
• Merit pay to outstanding teachers.
Maximize income: Lease surplus school properties. End mismanagement by incompetent Board members.

Eng opposes:
• Current programs teaching alternative lifestyle to our precious children. A violation of the First Amendment.
• Board members extravagant dinner meetings with liquor paid for by taxpayers. A blatant violation of the law.

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:
John Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Real Estate Broker, Former Supervisor
John Riordan, 1425 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Commissioner, Contractors State License Board, State of California
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor, Former Supervisor
Dr. John B. Tsu, 2 DENSO St., Education Commissioner
Melvin M. Belli, 2500 Broadway, Law Commissioner
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Landmark Preservation Board
Steven J. Doi, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
C. Mackey E. Salazar, 183 San Benito Way, City Planning Commissioner
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli St., Retired
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, State Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Robert Silverst, 300-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Anna Kyle Pausewang, 30 Cunningham Pl., Legal Assistant
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Vice President, District One Political Action
Kevin G. Molinar, 2247-26th Ave., Property Consultant
John S. Tang, M.D. 2184 Funston Ave., Physician
Timothy A. Tosta, 870 Ashbury St., Attorney
Jung Roy Gee, 665 Pine St., Investor, Education Researcher
William Bernstein, 1000 Franklin St., Attorney
Robert P. Varni, 10 Miller Pl., Chairman-Police Data Systems
Frank S. Yee, 358 Los Palmos Dr., Real Estate Finance; Teacher
Rev. Charles A. McMillen, 1300 Lawton St., Clergy
William Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney at Law
F. Theodore Kitt, 2801 Broadway, Lawyer
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis Ter., V.P.-Branch Manager, S & L
Volma Petersilie, 665 Pine St., Teacher
Ed Pond, 15-38th Ave., Insurance broker/Accoutant
S.M. Saroyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Business Enterprises/Lawyer
Frank N. Alioto, 2898 Vallejo St., Restaurant Owner
W.P. O’Keeffe, Sr., 444 Coret Ave., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Assn.

EUGENE S. HOPP, M.D.

My address is 601 Van Ness Ave., Opera Plaza
My occupation is Physician
My qualifications for office are: For the past thirteen years I have served on the Board of Education as an independent voice committed to the goal of educating all our children to their fullest potential. The current stress on teaching the basics must continue, combined with offerings of high technology and vocational courses designed to prepare our diverse student population for a changing future. I stand for an integrated educational program and welcome parents and the public to assist me in this challenge.

Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Eugene S. Hopp are:
Molly M. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Telecommunications Executive
Dianne Feinstein, 3020 Lyon St., Mayor
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Attorney
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Agnipino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, Vice President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr, 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Police Commissioner
Alfred J. Neider, 150 Casitas Ave., Police Commissioner
Alan S. Wong 1280 Ellis St., Commissioner, Community College
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member S F Community College
John F. Crowley, 87 Los Palmas Dr., Labor Official
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Amos J. Castro, 1401 California St., Physician
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Civil Rights Administrator
Harry Polland, 637 Powell St., Economist
Saul Madfes, 75 Country Club Dr., Retired, School Admin.
Jo Birnbaum, 1750 Taylor St., Housewife
Anita H. Sanchez, 44 Restani Way, Social Worker
Chadwick C. Ertola, 1460 Greenwich St., Attorney
Naomi Gray, 1291 Staney St., Businesswoman
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
Raye G. Richardson, 1714 Fillmore St., Assoc. Professor
Max L. Christensen, 2 Heather Ave., Clergyman
Larry Mazzola, 3050-24th Ave, Aast Business Mgr.
Leo J. Murphy, Sr., 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Lane E. De Lara, 2 Lenox Way, Educational Consultant
Gregory C. Lintner, 2600 Webster St., Realtor
Candidates for School Board

**TERRY HUGUNIN**

My address is 1824 Noriega Street  
My occupation is Consultant  
My age is 37  
**My qualifications for office are:** Those of us who were teenagers during President Kennedy’s Appolo Space Program thought there was nothing we and our nation might not accomplish: “We’re going to the moon in ten years!” Thanks to outfits like the National Education Association, the science oriented New Frontiers of the 60’s have given way to the “other-directedness” of the Aquarian Age. Their goal: form a society of androgy nous pacifists—study their literature. Mine is to restore the problem-solving orientation appropriate to Judeo-Christian culture. Help me mobilize our schools to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative and overcome the nuclear war threat.  

*Terry Hugunin*

---

**JAMES LEGARE**

My address is 254 Oak Street  
My occupation is Motor Truck Operator  
My age is 57  
**My qualifications for office are:** I am committed to installing a sound educational program in our schools as the basis for getting our country and economy moving again—in the American tradition. We need to develop young minds through a program of classical education and to protect them by wiping out drugs in the schools and in the nation.  

I propose to reform the school system along these lines:  
1) Classical geometry and physics, as typified by Plato, Archimedes, Cusa Kepler, and Leibniz  
2) Classical poetry, music, and drama, exemplified by Homer, Aeschylus, Dante, Shakespeare, Schiller, Bach, and Beethoven  

*James Legare*

---

**The sponsors for Terry Hugunin are:**

Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker  
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter  
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student  
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student  
Philip A. Bellish, 3250 Folsom St., Millman  
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator  
Michael Fraino, 1824 Noriega St., Student  
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired  
Elmora Hardy, 143 Fairlawn St., Housewife  
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator  
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative  
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant  
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician  
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant  
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator  
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife  
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother  
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer  
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired  
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist  
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales  
Michael Staininec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist  
John Vozaltis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

---

**The sponsors for James Legare are:**

Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker  
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter  
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student  
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student  
Philip A. Bellish, 3250 Folsom St., Millman  
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator  
Michael Fraino, 1824 Noriega St., Student  
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired  
Elmora Hardy, 143 Fairlawn St., Housewife  
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator  
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative  
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician  
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant  
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife  
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother  
Nick Pace, 130 Campbell Ave., Railroad Employee  
Sandra Parks, 16 Garces St., Railroad Employee  
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer  
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired  
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist  
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales  
Michael Staininec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist  
Nicholas E. Valegro, 875 Cayuga Ave., Electrician  
John Vozaltis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JO ANNE MILLER

My address is 1920 Quint Street
My occupation is Parent and Teacher

My qualifications for office are: I am the mother of two children in San Francisco Public Schools. I believe in the Public School System, and have a personal interest in its quality and effectiveness. I am a teacher of the blind. I am President of the Glen Park School Site Advisory Committee, and hold other elected civic offices.

The lack of parent representation on the School Board has contributed to a lack of parent and citizen involvement, a lack of long-term planning and vision in school administration, and a failure to commit the School District to a plan and goal of excellence for all children.

JoAnne Miller

BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones Street
My occupation is Transportation Analyst

My qualifications for office are: I believe I have provided outstanding leadership during my eight years on the San Francisco Board of Education. This is evidenced by the fact that test scores have improved and new programs have attracted students back from private schools.

As an active parent, I know San Francisco's schools first-hand. I have worked conscientiously for our children's future. I have the vision and I have gained the practical skills necessary to continue building our school district into one of the best large urban districts in the nation.

Benjamin Tom

The sponsors for JoAnne Miller are:

Julie C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Jeff Brown, 830-39th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Angel D. Contreras, 1461 Alabama St., Administrator of Headstart
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Dening St., President, San Francisco NOW
Linda Fries, 830-39th Ave., Community Organizer
Bob Geary, 2578 Great Highway, San Francisco Police Officer
Louise Harvey, 673 Fulton St., Educational Consultant
Marilee Hearn, 3030 Turk Blvd., Teacher
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Ron Hufneman, 61 Walter St., District Attorney Investigator
Daro Inouye, 251 Gates St., Attorney
Cleve Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Assistant
LaRoy King, 7536 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir., ILWU
Myra G. Kropf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Jean E. Kortum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member of Board of Supervisors
Peter Mezey, 3383 Clay St., Business Executive
Hugh B. Miller, 385 Roosevelt Way, Attorney
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
James E. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Taxi Cab Owner
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director, CAHEED, Inc.
Jerry Ringerman, 485 Crestmont Dr., Executive Director, San Francisco Jewish Community Center
Thelma Shelley, 76 Eveson St., Performing Arts Administrator
A. John Shimmon, 700 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., President, AAFUM

The sponsors for Ben Tom are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Wendy Nelder, 130 Casitas Ave., Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Supervisor, San Francisco
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commission
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director, CYO
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Jess T. Esteva, 5258 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Ben L. Hom, 1 Villa Ter., Banker, Executive
Alfon S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker, Community College Board Member
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director, Pre-Trial Diversion Project
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor, City and County Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrer St., Planning Commissioner
Myra G. Kropf, 1940-12th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Board Member School Administrator
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Business Representative
Jeff Brown, 830-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembleyman, 16th District

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ERNEST "CHUCK" AYALA

My address is 4402-20th Street
My occupation is Youth Director, CYO-Urban Development Division
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan, South of Market neighborhood. Attended public and parochial schools, including City and Lone Mountain Colleges. My involvement in community development and public service is with youth in Education, Employment and Delinquency Prevention, in addition to developing and administering Senior Citizens and Veterans Programs. Business management background in labor, insurance and real estate provides me with a balanced approach to fiscal and administrative objectives of the Community College District. My continued goal for the Community College District is to retain its open door policy and remain responsive to the educational and vocational needs of the people.

Ernest Chuck Ayala

The sponsors for Ernest "Chuck" Ayala are:

Reginald Y. Alexander, 182 Middlefield Dr., Vice Chancellor, Certified
Bernice E. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Homemaker
Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College District
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, S.F. Community College Board
Vincent J. Callan, 4038 19th St., Retired
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot St., House Wife
Marjorie M Colvin, 1835 Franklin St. #1403, Housewife
Peter J. Fatooh, 30 Grand View Ave., Businessman
William L. Fazio, 110 Inverness Dr., Asst District Attorney
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley St., Management Consultant
Al Graf, 859 Bryant St., Businessman
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Marcel Kapulica, 2470 22nd Ave., Dental Laboratory-Owner
Louis E. Lagger, 4001 21st St., District Manager, Packing Co.
Dorothy J. Lubetich, 15 Fiorentine St., Retired
Ernestine A. McGoldrick, 4442 20th St., School Clerk/Housewife
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., 1789 Eucalyptus St., State Assemblyman-Retired
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Susan Ann Roualades, 340-A Tamal St., Florist
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., President, S.F. Police Commission
Bob (Robert) Schmidt, 4048 21st St., Librarian
Thomata M. Scott, 1912-14 Broderick St., Youth Program Coordinator
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba St., Educator/Police Commissioner
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Bernard J. Ward, 3300 Kirkham St., Atty at law
Bill Zorzakis, 545 Castro St., Shoe Repairer

AMOS CLEOPHILUS BROWN

My address is 111 Lunado Way
My occupation is Clergyman
My age is 43
My qualifications for office are: I hold the B.A., M.Div. and D.D. degrees. 16 years of public service on boards of education throughout the U.S. more than qualifies me for the position.

My services on the Board of Governors since 1982 reflect that I am competent and able to work with a team of governors to ensure the delivery of a quality education system for all persons in our community who desire training for marketable skills. Community College also must serve the needs of those who for various reasons have not had the opportunity of going to other institutions of higher learning for training.

Amos C. Brown

The sponsors for Amos C. Brown are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Member, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, Community College Board
Priscilla A. Denard, 210 Broad St., Secretary
James Gordon Emerson, Jr., 175 Beaumont St., Clergyman
Mayor Duane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Zelma R. Harrison, 1957 Hayes St., Bookkeeper
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Grandy A. Jackson, 257 Kensington Way, Retired
Clifton R. Jeffers, 1883 14th Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor
John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Lauraret Newkirk, 534 Brussels St., System Support Librarian
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Naomi Shines, 756 Page St., Fiscal Clerk
Rabbi Malcolm M. Sparer, 1059 Clement St., Rabbi
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Dorris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillfritas St., Minister
Hannibal A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergyman
Tomothy R. Wofred, 91 Sanchez, President, College Board
Alain S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PATRICK C. FITZGERALD

My address is 128 Detroit Street
My occupation is San Francisco County Central Committee, 16th Assembly District.
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are:

- Am married, father of three children and a homeowner
- Graduated: St. Ignatius College Prep. and City College of San Francisco
- Elected San Francisco County Central Committee (since 1970)
- California State Central Committee (since 1978)
- Attended San Francisco 1984 National Presidential Convention for Mondale-Ferrero
- Served on San Francisco City Government CATV Task Force Educational Access Committee
- Instrumental in adoption of San Francisco City College Labor Studies Program
- Great Nephew of former San Francisco County Supervisor Tom O'Dowd
- Past Secretary San Francisco County Central Committee
- Strong opponent 1983 Feinstein Recall
- Successfully fought peripheral canal
- Support Propositions: 33 (disabled homeowners) and 40 (political campaign reform).

Patrick C. Fitzgerald

The sponsors for Patrick C. Fitzgerald are:

Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official
John J. Moylan, 2985-294 Ave., Labor Leader
Terence Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Marion L. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Social Worker
Patricia K. Moor, 1762-17th Ave., Tax Consultant/Bookkeeper
Josephine Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman

Clara Stein, 2390 Sloat Blvd., Cashier
Brian J. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Real Estate Broker
Sue T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., State Central Committeewoman

Mildred K. Bird, 1762-17th Ave., Retired
Mary Ann Cowen, 134 Detroit St., Secretary
Charles T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Retired
Emily H. Shimmon, 19 Middlefield St., Housewife
Thomas P. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Displayman
Esther F. Zott, 75 Middlefield St., Retired
Peter B. Paragas, 1923 San Jose Ave., Engineering Graduate
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Adriano Biagiotti, 131 Detroit St., Retired

A. Lee Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, City College Graduate
Kenneth J. Lukas, 215 Detroit St., Carpenter
Lloyd A. Quain, 96 Staples St., Retired
Louise E. Quain, 96 Staples St., Retired
William T. Bray, 207 San Juan Ave., Gatemen
Mary B. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Homemaker
Lisa L. Kloueuer, 135 San Felipe Way, County Central Committeewoman

Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
Jim Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Arlo H. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney

DEAN GOODMAN

My address is 825 Geary Street #703
My occupation is Retired Teacher/Actor
My age is 64

My qualifications for office are: Thirty years of teaching, an educator’s concern for quality instruction, and a citizen’s awareness of the need for budget control. As the first fulltime president of the Community College Federation of Teachers, Local 2121 and as a former staff member of the District I know well the policies and procedures which form the structure of the Community College and the College Centers.

If elected, I will insist on fair hiring practices, and as a member of that most diverse of all groups, our Senior Citizens, I will support college services for all adults regardless of individual differences.

Dean Goodman

The sponsors for Dean Goodman are:

Prisilla Alden, 1677 Bush St., #8, Actress
Ugo Baldassari, 988 Dolores St., Theatre Director
James E. Ballard, 2 Arbor St., Teacher
Sheldon I Balman, 5 Persigo Ter., Attorney
Laurent R. Broussal, 655 Quintara St., Administrator, Community College
Kim Conrad, 1330 Bush St., Bar Owner
Donald G. Climent, 117 Ord St., Refugee Resettlement Counselor
Lauri Fried-Lee, 435 19th Ave., Community College Instructor
William Gundel, 1415 Franklin St., Credit Adjuster
Frances T. Hughes, 2649 Polk St., Legal Secretary
Donna Ilyn, 76 6th Ave., Counselor
Lynda Bergren Kalb, 24 Magnolia St., Singer/Actress
Michael J. Mandel, 12 Marne St., Attorney
Donnald J. Miller, 26 Leo St., Furniture Manufacturer
Jay Moran, 1667 Page St., Business Representative
Allen Nomura, 177 Boana St., Theatrical Photographer
Judy Winn-Bell Olsen, 1289 29th Ave., Teacher/Author/Editor
Roger E. W-B Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Publisher
Frank Reilly, 3415 Divisadero St., Advertising/Actor
James J. Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Rev. James E. Smidmore, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
Eve Stoddard, 180 Diamond St., Probate Administration
Daniel A. Sullivan, 1590 Sacramento St., Attorney
Doug Trantham, 701 Taylor St., Pianist
Skegins Wurschmidt, 1142 DeFaro St., Actress
Samuel L. Zanze, 2301 25th Ave., Businessman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ANDRE F. PEHARGOU

My address is 3840 Fulton Street
My occupation is Civil Servant
My qualifications for office are: I have been a resident of San Francisco for 34 years. I am a graduate of California State University San Francisco; San Francisco City College, and Lowell High School.

Most taxpayers are not benefitting from the Community College System due to lack of information and lack of convenient locations.

As a Board member, I will advocate a strong academic curriculum; More neighborhood locations to facilitate Senior citizens and working taxpayers; Better utilization of present facilities, and a decrease in tuition fees for City residents.

If you want expanded services to help benefit you, give me your support on election day.

Andre F. Pehargou

The sponsors for Adre F. Pehargou are:
William Angelopoulos, 59 Prague St., Employed
Renee Boulay, 605 Arguello Blvd., Retired
Josephine Bucchiotti, 353 25th Ave., Retired
Andre Carrey, 467 2nd Ave., Retired
James Edward Coleman, 620 Banks St., Supervisor
Alice Crovere, 1827 Balboa St., Part Time Office Worker
Robert S. Fishman, 151 Buchanan St., Operations Officer, S. F. Airport
Emma Garrigues, 2702 Anza St., Retired
Diana Hanlan, 361 25th Ave., Teacher
Rose Hanman, 720 La Playa St., #307, Retired
Paulletta Henderson, 798 Naples St., Retired
Paul Keplinger, 3832 Fulton St., Concourse
Anna Konor, 3315 Irving St., Retired
James Courtney Kovach, 1282 43rd Ave., Lithographer
Eva Lim, 3832 Fulton St., Assn. Paymistress
D. Martin, 87 Seward St., Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788-18th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor's degree in Psychology from the University of San Francisco; Master's in Education from Stanford University; Juris Doctorate from Hastings College of Law; a wife, mother, former teacher and counselor; and presently, Assistant District Attorney in San Francisco.

I have served diligently, always conscious of my responsibility to all the communities of San Francisco who gave me the highest number of votes four years ago. I strive to ensure that the Community College will continue providing quality education to all students, even during financial crises, without sacrificing student or faculty needs. As the only woman board member, I actively support women's issues.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
Sala Burton, 8 Slott Blvd., Congresswoman
John Yehall Chinn, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal
Art Agnos, 657 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guerrero St., Member Board of Supervisors
DeRis M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member Board of Supervisors
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Univ of Calif Regent
John L. Molinar, 30-16th Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Commissioner, Board of Education/School Administrator
Ario E. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant SF Sheriff's Dept.
Amos C. Brown, 11 Lunado Way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Slott Blvd., Member SF Community College Board
Madeline H. Russell, 3778 Washington St., Investments
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Agrinopino R. Cerbatoe, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Anne Bellisie Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Director
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member SF Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Linda A. Post, 1864-15th St., Community Activist
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Incumbent SF Supervisor
Bette W. Landis, 44 Entraina Ct., Volunteer
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney's Investigator
Jeffrey K. Mori, 360 Prefete Ave., Executive Director

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 910 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Educator

My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer/Worker, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

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

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

Moy Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy Velasquez are:

Lilian Aldea, 231 Granada Ave., Teacher
Concepcion G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Teacher
Melandro Busto, 49 Capp St., Student
Victoriano G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Mechanic
Stasia Cagara, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Sales
Rosita T. Castaneda, 18 Guy Pl., Teacher's Aide
Enecaracion P. Ceppedes, 931 Prague St., Teacher
Cheryl R. Conway, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student
Theresa N. Fabro, 4186 Mission St., School Lunchroom Manager
Kenneth A. Guerra, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Technician
Odelia Jones, 1775 Newcomb Ave., Housekeeper
Felicia D. Misenas, 266 Brighton Ave., School Lunch Helper
Basil C. Nickerson, 336-6th St., Self Employed
Willie B. Nicholas, 1231-5th Ave., Custodian
Jack Lee Ponewash, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Production Manager
Margaret M. Powers, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Customer Service
Clarice D. Robinson, 2445 Harrison St., Teacher's Aide
Enecaracion A. Rumos, 2706 Folsom St., Room Cleaner
Murdie Washington, 195 Highland St., Monitor
David A. Woodard, 397 Green St., Chef

DR. TIM WOLFRED

My address is 91 Sanchez Street
My occupation is Incumbent, President, San Francisco Community College Board

My qualifications for office are: As an incumbent, I am proud of a College Board that, with less dollars than it had four years ago, has kept all programs operating and has expanded services to San Franciscans most dependent on a healthy community college system for access to job skills training and a basic college education. Neighborhood college centers have moved into larger, renovated facilities. Vocational offerings in fields like computer technologies, nursing, and auto mechanics have been updated. Classes in language skills have been strengthened in immigrant communities. We are a Board dedicated to quality education open to all San Franciscans.

Dr. Tim Wolfred

The sponsors for Dr. Tim Wolfred are:

Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
Willie Brown, 1200 Gough St., Assembly Member
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembly Member
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff, City and County of San Francisco
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinaro, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Bill Maher, 89 Eslie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Alan Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Julie Tang, 789-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Member, Community College Board
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Sodonia Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., School Board Member
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member
Agrupino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave, School Board Member
Carlota T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Harold Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist
A. Cecil Williams, 69 Hillrise St., Pastor, Glide Church
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher
Sandy Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Thomas Peretti, 3787-16th St., Banker
Paul Bonenberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Official
Carole Migden, 563-28th St., Executive Director, Operation Concern

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Port Revenue Bonds

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities? YES 253 NO 254

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Port Commission operates the Port of San Francisco. When funds are needed for Port construction or improvements, the Commission may issue revenue bonds to raise funds. A majority of the voters must approve these bonds before they can be issued. The revenue bonds are then paid from Port revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance several improvements of Port property. These improvements include modernizing container handling facilities, upgrading various piers, constructing a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, and renovating certain other Port structures and property. The bonds would then be paid off from Port revenues.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance improvements of Port property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Port Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

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

| Bond redemption | $ 42,500,000 |
| Bond interest   | 81,761,400   |
| Total debt service requirement | $124,261,400 |

"Based on a three year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning four years after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $4,462,000 to a maximum of $5,760,000 annually for twenty-seven years.

"In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Port revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Port sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Port. Analysis of projected resources available to the Port indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years."

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On July 30 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on a motion placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 51.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The revitalization of the Port of San Francisco will bring new jobs and new tax revenue to the City. A healthy port, with increased ship traffic, will bring millions each year to the San Francisco economy.

By delaying modernizations in the past, the Port of San Francisco lost the bulk of its maritime business to other Bay Area and West Coast cities. *The same mistakes must not be made twice.* We must allow the Port to use revenues to finance continued improvements.

*Proposition A does not authorize any new taxes.* Proposition A simply authorizes the Port to use revenues to finance improvements and expansion.

Proposition A will allow for the modernization of existing container cargo terminals on the southern waterfront. These improved facilities will retain current business and will bring new lines to San Francisco. The return of the shipping business will bring back long lost blue collar jobs to the waterfront as well as white collar jobs.

In addition, Proposition A will provide for expansion of the passenger facility, a new breakwater to protect the commercial fishing fleet, and improved rail access to the port. In all, Proposition A will upgrade and modernize San Francisco Port facilities so as to make them competitive with other ports across the Bay and throughout the West Coast.

The complete modernization effort will be done at no cost to the taxpayers. Instead, the Port of San Francisco’s income will be used to finance long-term revenue bonds.

The people of San Francisco deserve a first-rate port. We urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote YES on Proposition A.

As Mayor, I have worked hard to restore our port to its historic pre-eminence as a major gateway to the Far East.

Once again, major shipping lines are docking in San Francisco. Just recently, two of the largest container vessel operators, China Ocean Shipping Corporation and Columbus Lines, signed agreements to use this port.

Not only modern cargo carriers, but passenger liners as well are being drawn to San Francisco in a remarkable renaissance of maritime commerce.

But if there is to be a lasting renewal of our waterfront, the port must be competitive with other port cities anxiously contending for the burgeoning Pacific trade. The port, if it is to prosper, must modernize and enlarge its basic maritime facilities.

That’s the purpose of Proposition A.

*Proposition A will make the Port of San Francisco truly and vigorously competitive. And it will not cost the taxpayers a penny.*

Proposition A will authorize $42.5 million in revenue bonds for vital waterfront projects, including the conversion of Pier 80 into a modern, state-of-the-art container facility and the enlargement and modernization of cargo operations at Piers 94 and 96.

Additionally, Proposition A will provide funds for repairing the now deteriorating Jefferson Street Seawall and will match Federal dollars for construction of a much-needed breakwater to protect the City’s fishing fleet at Fisherman’s Wharf.

Proposition A also will finance expansion of the passenger terminal at Pier 35.

*Proposition A is a prudent investment in the City’s future. And these bonds are payable only from port revenues—your taxes will not be increased.*

More ships, with more cargo and more passengers, mean more jobs and greater economic vitality for our city.

Proposition A will make our port, once again, a strong and lasting competitor for the commerce of the Pacific Basin. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco needs a good, working port. Vote yes on Proposition A and help bring it about.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Citizens of San Francisco are worried about the deterioration of the port. Most of us can remember when the port was a thriving, bustling commercial enterprise, and the docks were maintained, clean, efficient, and busy.

But, the port has not adapted to container cargo, and may be losing the few shipping lines that it now serves.

We must restructure the docks for active container shipping, and bring in railway lines to service the docks.

We have one of the few deep water ports in America, an essential for modern shipping. LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT BEING ONE OF THE BEST PORTS IN THE WEST AGAIN!

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Wendy Nelder
President of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will permit the Port of San Francisco to issue bonds to finance needed construction and improvements. This would give the Port the same financing ability the Airport now has.

Through the issuance of revenue bonds, the Port would be able to undertake necessary improvements AT NO COST TO TAXPAYERS.

San Francisco deserves a modern, thriving port. Proposition A will help us build modern terminals, a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf which will help keep commercial fishermen in San Francisco, repair the seawall at Jefferson Street and expand our Passenger Terminal to handle increased cruise business that brings millions of dollars into our local economy.

Proposition A will give the Port of San Francisco the ability to make these kinds of improvements. Please join me in voting YES.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A offers San Franciscans the opportunity to direct the future of the Port of San Francisco.

This measure will provide our Port with the key to the future.

We must keep pace with new developments, increase cargo and create new jobs. For every fifty new containers we move, 1.67 new jobs will be created.

This measure also includes funding for construction of the Fisherman's Wharf Breakwater, which is critically needed and long overdue.

Take part in the future of our Port. Join with me in voting YES on Proposition A.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a waterfront city. We have a superb natural harbor, which is also one of the few really deep water harbors—vital for modern deep water cargo ships.

We have used our badly deteriorating and long unimproved pier facilities to their maximum efficiency. But . . . times are changing. We must move NOW to keep pace with new developments, or risk enormous losses in cargo shipping, commercial fishing, and tourist trade.

It is ESSENTIAL that we adapt to container cargo that can be moved by train, truck, and ship.

Research has been done on what could give us the greatest increase in efficiency and profits for the very least amount of money. And the answer is: modernizing the South Terminal for adaptation to container cargo; providing rail access to the docks; protecting the commercial fishing fleet with a breakwater; and expanding passenger-handling facilities for cruise passenger tourists.

Prop A will provide these improvements RIGHT NOW. And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION
Arthur H. Coleman, President
James Rudden, Vice President
Gordon Lau, Member
Anne Halsted, Member
James Herman, Member

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

Fisherman's Wharf is a valued segment of the community and needs your help to ensure its economic well-being.

A YES vote on Proposition A will provide the needed financing to build the long awaited breakwater to ensure the safety of our commercial fishing fleet, create new berths and new jobs.

A YES vote on Proposition A will repair the Jefferson Street Seawall before it becomes a dangerous hazard to our visitors and to our community.

A YES vote will insure the economic vitality of Fisherman's Wharf as well as the entire San Francisco Waterfront.

Join with us and vote YES.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Louis Ferrari, President
Crab Boat Owner's Association

Christopher Martin
President, Fisherman's Wharf Merchant Assoc.
Fritz Arko
Alessandro Baccari
Ex. Secretary, Fisherman's Wharf Merchant Assoc.
L. B. Barnes
Fisherman's Wharf Seafood
Phil Bentivegna
Fishing Boat Butchie B
Bob Bugatto
California Shell Fish Co.
Ken Burger
Franciscan Restaurant
Pat Flanagan
Standard Fisheries
Anthony Casali
Fishing Boat Lorene

Virgil P. Caselli, Native S. Joseph Cincotta
S. Joseph Cincotta F. Alioto Fish Co.
F. Alioto Fish Co. Nick D'Amato
Nick D'Amato Fishing Boat Nicky D
Nino Gerald Tom Lazio
Tom Lazio Fish Co. Andrew Loli
Andrew Loli William McDonnell
William McDonnell Albert Spadaro
Albert Spadaro Sports Fishing Boat
Sports Fishing Boat New Flories
New Flories Mario J. Alioto
Mario J. Alioto Calif. Seafood Institute
Calif. Seafood Institute Peter Brown
Peter Brown The Anchorage

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The opportunity is NOW!

Our Northern Waterfront is alive with activity—increase in passenger ships, thriving commercial developments.

Let us fuse that energy into our Southern Waterfront and take advantage of our natural deep water. That means newer, deeper draft merchant ships, increased cargoes and new jobs.

Missed opportunities cannot be recaptured. So act now! Don't let this opportunity get away.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Sec/Treasurer San Francisco Labor Council
Le Roy King
Regional Director ILWU
Tim Twomey, President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trade Council
Chuck Mack, President
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our waterfront is an outstandingly beautiful and profitable aspect of San Francisco. The port has been badly neglected, however. We need to VOTE YES ON PROP A to improve and rebuild cargo and passenger facilities.

PROP A will guarantee increased maritime activities, new jobs, the revival of our fishing industry, and the safety of shoreline areas.

And...AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!
For our neighborhood, and for our City, VOTE YES ON PROP A!

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors

Phyllis Kern
Golden Gate Democratic Club*
Jim Wachob
District 8 Democratic Club*
Kevin Malone
District 8 Democratic Club*
Bette Lands
Democratic Women's Forum*
Rebecca Evans
Sierra Club*
Beverly Kaniat
Committee for Better Parks
and Recreation in Chinatown*

*for identification purposes only

Richard Livingston
Open Space Committee*
Adria Garabedian
Andrea Jepson
Madrid Hamilton
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Wallinda McCrea
Douglas Engmann
Dale Carlson
Stafford Buckley
Dick Pabich
Ron Huberman
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a great port city. And the San Francisco Port has always been a leading employer of minorities.

But the Port has sadly deteriorated. It has not kept up with modernizations and improvements. And what is even worse, it has not kept up with the competition. The Port MUST adapt to container cargo, and put in railway access to the docks. With your vote YES ON A, we can take advantage of our deep water harbor, attract more shipping trade, increase cargoes, and produce many more jobs.

And... AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER! VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Naomi Gray Mabel Schine
Doris Thomas Linda Dickens
J. E. Thomas Faye Anderson
A. Brooks Zuretti Goosby
Frankie Gillette Stan Palomares-Criollos
Lois DeCayette Jene Rita Alviar
Joel DeCayette Ernest C. Ayala
Julie Anderson Alan S. Wong
Altheda Carrie Stan Moy
George Newkirk Douglas S. Chan
Elouise Westbrook Thomas Hsieh
Shirley Jones Alicia Wang
Clifton Jeffers Ben Tom
Joe Williams Pius Lee
Carol Belle Julie Tang
Benjamin James Louis Hop Lee
Grandvel Jackson Dennis Wong
Amos Brown Melvin Dong Lee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our Port now needs $42 million to develop San Francisco's maritime facilities to compete with ports such as Oakland, Seattle and San Diego.

These improved facilities are vital to San Francisco's competition for jobs and trade for the Pacific. Currently all major west coast ports are building to meet the growing needs of America's Pacific Trade. These ports have each spent an average of $57 million on recent container cargo expansion while San Francisco has spent nothing.

San Francisco must have at least comparable facilities in order to compete in this market. If the port is not developed for container cargo, San Francisco can forget about being a major port on the west coast as well as lose the jobs and revenue that a modern port could produce.

The Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that you vote to bring San Francisco the jobs and business that will be created by these revenue bonds. The bonds will be paid off from Port revenue and there is no taxpayer risk.

If you want to see the Port continue to grow and prosper vote yes on Proposition A.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reconstruct municipal harbor facilities!!!:

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

Juanita G. Raven
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committeeman
Bob Geary
Democratic County Committeeman
Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Martin Eng

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

When something is railroaded through City Hall on a "fast track", it is always difficult not to join the stampede. This, however, is a bond issue in an amount larger than necessary to perform the actual work contemplated; not backed by written leases; and not backed even by "letter agreements" with corporations which supposedly will use Piers 80, 94 and 96 if improvements are made. This bond issue was rushed through the Board of Supervisors. Transmitted to the Board on July 24th, a scant six days later (on July 30th) and without a specific noticed public hearing, the Board voted 7-1 to place it on the ballot. I dissented because more time was needed for a proper analysis and public input.

Presently, the Port has a debt service requirement of approximately $194,000,000.00. This proposed revenue bond issue would increase the debt service requirement to $228,261,400.00; a staggering rise. The $42,500,000.00 bond issue would produce but $40,202,000.00 in proceeds. The Port has a surplus of about $19,000,000.00, of which approximately $15,000,000.00 is available for capital projects. The Controller says $49,254,660.00, would thus be available for capital projects costing $41,610,000.00.

The Port is borrowing $7,644,660.00 more than is needed for these seven capital projects. Why? The Port admits it has no long-term written commitments for Piers 80, 94 and 96 which account for $37,570,000.00 of the total bond issue. How can we be assured that the bondholders will be repaid by revenues from those piers if there are no long-term commitments?

Moreover, the Port hasn't even secured written "letter agreements" from corporations to assure that if those improvements are made, they will sign long-term commitments. Ironically, but $4,000,000.00 of the bond issue would be spent on needed improvements for Fisherman's Wharf tenants, who generate almost 50% of net Port income, money which would be used to repay the money borrowed for Piers 80, 94 and 96. It's like the tail wagging the dog.

Selling bonds is nothing more than borrowing money. Why borrow more money than you have to, and why borrow money for projects which don't have long-term tenants? Be assured that even if this passes, I intend to persist in making Port officials answer those very questions.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

MOTION AUTHORIZING
PROPOSITION A

MOTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A MEASURE AUTHORIZING THE PORT COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS TO FINANCE THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION OF CERTAIN PORT FACILITIES TO BE LOCATED AT THE PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby orders submitted to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 6, 1984 a measure authorizing the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to issue revenue bonds, all as set forth in the following measure, to wit:

Shall the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $42,500,000 the proceeds of which will be used to modernize container handling facilities and to upgrade various other mariti
time-oriented facilities at the Port of San Francisco's piers 35, 80, 94 and 96 and at the Jefferson Street seawall, to construct a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf, to construct an intermodal container transfer facility, to install a backflow prevention system at various locations, to replace various transformers and capacitors throughout the port, and to acquire, construct or renovate certain works, property or structures necessary or convenient for the operation of, and at, the Port of San Francisco, which facilities are operated by the Port Commission?

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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USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Water Revenue Bonds

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?  

YES 256

NO 257

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission operates the San Francisco Water Department. When the Commission needs funds to acquire, improve or develop Water Department facilities, it may issue revenue bonds to raise the funds. Before the Commission can issue revenue bonds, a majority of the voters must approve. The revenue bonds are then paid from Water Department revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds. Funds from the sale of the bonds would be used to acquire, improve or develop facilities necessary for the operation of the Water Department, including filtration plants and reservoirs. The bonds would be paid off from the revenues of the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance Water Department improvements.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Public Utilities Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond redemption</th>
<th>$104,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>169,260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt service requirement</td>
<td>$273,260,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Based on a five year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning one year after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $3,467,000 to a maximum of $14,022,000 annually for thirty-one years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Water Department revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Water Department sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Water Department. Analysis of projected resources available to the Water Department indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on a resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

The Text of Proposition B appears on Page 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The money from these bonds will be used to assure that drinking water we take from our Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs on the Peninsula is pure and meets all health standards. The bonds will be repaid from revenues of our Water Department. Not a penny will be charged on the property tax rolls or to the general taxpayers.

We have two huge lakes along side I-280 on the Peninsula, the Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs. About 15% of our drinking water in normal times comes from these lakes and others in Alameda County. For decades we used this water without filtration. Now, however, health officials tell us that all of the water from our Peninsula lakes must be filtered before it can be used. We now have a very limited filtering capacity which means that if, for any reason, our water supply from the Sierras were interrupted or reduced and we would need more local water, we would be unable to make full use of Crystal Springs water. There now is no filter plant at Crystal Springs. Whatever water we use from there must be pumped up to a small filtration plant at San Andreas before it can enter the system. This very severely limits the amount of drinking water we can draw from our nearest supply, and it is expensive. Passage of Proposition B would change all that.

By voting YES on B, you will provide for water system improvements including a new filtration plant right at Crystal Springs, for the expansion of the small plant at San Andreas, and for a necessary storage reservoir.

Your YES on B vote is an investment in the quality of our drinking water—an assurance that water from our nearest supply will be available to us pure, meeting all health requirements, when we need it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Generations ago, San Franciscans had the foresight to build one of the most magnificent water systems in the world—Hetch Hetchy, which brings water to San Francisco from the High Sierras.

Now, we must modernize the system to keep pace with higher standards of water quality.

Proposition B will authorize the San Francisco Water Department to issue $104 million in revenue bonds.

The money will be used to improve the system by expanding existing plants and by building additional filtration, treatment and holding facilities on Water Department properties on the Peninsula.

These facilities will provide safe drinking water for future generations of San Franciscans. Presently, if any of the existing facilities suffered a breakdown, the City could be forced to rely upon unfiltered water from Crystal Springs. The State Department of Public Health has directed the Water Department to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Our water is safe. It meets all state and Federal quality standards, and we want to keep it that way. Proposition B will assure low turbidity (silt content), reduce asbestos content, and prevent the spread of giardia lamblia, a virus not now found in our water system, but which could be brought in as watershed areas become more populated.

Proposition B, which will not have any effect on our tax structure, is a prudent investment, protecting our drinking water into the future. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote yes on Proposition B and help guarantee us pure, plentiful water.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED
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Health Commission

PROPOSITION C
Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven
members appointed by the Mayor be created to
manage and control City and County hospitals and
all other county health services and appoint a Direc-
tor of Public Health?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco De-
partment of Public Health operates the county
hospitals, such as San Francisco General and
Laguna Honda, and all other county public
health services. The Department is run by a
Public Health Director, who is appointed by
the City's Chief Administrative Officer and
who is responsible to the Chief Administrative
Officer.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would create a
Health Commission, and place the Depart-
ment of Public Health under the control of
the Commission. The Commission would have
seven members, appointed by the Mayor; no
more than three members would be doctors,
nurses, hospital administrators or other health
care professionals. The Commission would ap-
point a Public Health Director, responsible to
the Commission, to administer the Depart-
ment. The Public Health Director could ap-
point and remove deputies to help administer
the Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you
want the San Francisco Department of Public
Health to be under the control of a Health
Commission appointed by the Mayor, and to
be run by a Public Health Director, appointed
by the Health Commission.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want
the San Francisco Department of Public
Health to be under the control of the Chief
Administrative Officer and to be run by a
Public Health Director appointed by the Chief
Administrative Officer.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the
question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Bill
Maher, John Molinari, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth
Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp and
Wendy Nelder.

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be
adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the
cost of government, based on current costs of
the Health Department, by approximately
$8,400 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Public Health Department has a budget of over $270 million and a staff of 5000, making it the largest agency in City government. Its responsibilities are many and far-reaching: San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital; emergency medical services; mental health services; sanitation; public health education; district health centers; inspection of public and private facilities. The list is long and growing.

In recent years, the list of problems facing departmental administrators has, unfortunately, also grown. Emergency Aid stations were closed. Ambulance service was drastically altered. Proposals to reorganize community mental health services were promoted and rejected, causing confusion for all. The AIDS crisis. The investigations at San Francisco General Hospital. And on and on.

Too often, these decisions and these issues were considered in a vacuum, without public input, without public debate, and without public scrutiny.

Why? In order to protect the Department of Public Health from the graft and corruption that plagued our City at the turn of the century, the Charter placed the department under the Chief Administrative Officer's auspices rather than a commission. Fifty years later, the department has outgrown this cumbersome arrangement. It is time to bring the administration of this important agency into the 20th Century, mirroring the management of other City departments.

Proposition C will establish a seven-member Health Commission, appointed by the Mayor, to set policy and supervise the Public Health Department. The commission will include both providers and consumers of health services. It will bring the Department more directly under the Mayor's control, allowing for more timely responses to issues and problems. Most importantly, it will ensure that the department is publicly accountable for its actions.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Public health policy has changed and the governance of our public health department must change too.

In the past few years the state and federal governments have shifted more and more of the responsibility for public health management to local governments.

Recent experience shows that our health department is not presently equipped to manage public health programs in the most effective manner.

Proposition C will streamline management—cutting two levels of bureaucracy while opening up our public health policy to the public itself.

I urge a "yes" vote on Proposition C.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Since 1971, the Department of Public Health has been plagued with problems and crises at its hospitals, clinics and emergency aid stations. Most recently, we again faced the threat of San Francisco General losing its accreditation. These many incidents are deeply disturbing, raising troubling questions in the public mind: Why do these problems persist? Why can't something be done about them once and for all?

In 1979, the national organization that accredits all hospitals reported that San Francisco General's "major problems . . . are related to the lack of an effective governing body free from the political decision-making process which results in delayed activity, inadequate funding, etc." Last January, the State auditors also cited the absence of "a governing body legally responsible for hospital governance" as a cause for "ineffective management."

No other hospital in California operates without a board of directors. Only one other department in San Francisco (Public Works) operates without a commission. Instead, San Francisco General and the Health Department are run by a bureaucracy, insulated from public accountability.

Proposition C establishes a commission for the Health Department, one that will hold public hearing, make public decisions, and be publicly accountable. Vote YES.

Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
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**Health Commission**

**Supervisor John Molinari**
**Hon. John Morrisey**
**Hon. Charlotte Berk**
**Hon. Douglas Engmann**
**Hon. Edward Fleishoff**
**Hon. Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd**
**Hon. Gordon Lau**
**Hon. Esta Soler**
**Hon. Louis Giraudo**

**Hon. Jerry Berg**
**Hon. Doris Kahn**
**Hon. Richard Guggenheim**
**Hon. Joe Jung**
**Hon. John Sanger**
**Hon. Jean Kortum**
**Hon. Anne Halsted**
**Hon. Linda Eberth**
**Hon. Judith Brecka**

**Hon. Carlotta DelPortillo**
**Hon. Jo Daly**
**Hon. Drucilla Ramey**
**Hon. Walter Jebe**
**Hon. Bette Landis**
**Hon. Dr. Yoshio Nakashima**
**Hon. Samuel Chung**
**Hon. Louis Hop Lee**
**Hon. Dale Carlson**

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C**

San Francisco's population is aging. In a few short years, a greater percentage of our citizens will be seniors—most living independently on fixed incomes, many frail and over 75—than those of other California cities. They will need nutritional information, home health care, and a broad range of coordinated social services.

The Department of Health, San Francisco General, Laguna Honda, the District Health Centers—these are critical providers of senior services. And as more and more state and federal programs are shifted to local agencies, the Department's role and responsibilities will dramatically increase.

How will the Department respond to this increased responsibility? How can we ensure that it will develop policies and programs that meet seniors' needs? And how can we be sure that these programs operate efficiently and effectively?

Proposition C is a big step in the right direction. VOTE YES!

**Kathleen Lammers**
**Abraham Biderman**
**Jeannette Harris**
**Larry Bernardini, R.N.**
**Nancy Boughey, M.S.W.**
**David Lally, M.S.W.**
**Ollie Mae Black**
**Stephen Graham**

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C**

Proposition C is important for women.

Women provide the majority of services offered by the Health Department. Indeed public health is traditionally the domain of women and nurses. And while the many crises at General are too often blamed on nursing care, nurses virtually have no role in planning or organizing service delivery.

Women are also the major consumers of the Department's services. As more and more block grants transfer health programs from the state and federal levels to local governments, the Department will become an increasingly important provider to women.

Proposition C gives women an opportunity to make their voices heard at the highest levels of the Health Department. And our voices must be heard if services are to be organized efficiently and responsively.

**Golden Gate Nurses Association**
**San Francisco N.O.W.**
**B. J. Badertscher, R.N.M.S.**
**Ellen Wolfe, R.N.P.N.P.**
**Suzanne Harris, L.V.N., R.N.**
**Annie Borgenicht, L.V.N.**
**Shea Watkins, L.V.N.**
**Pamela Klein, R.P.T.**
**Catherine M. Coleman, R.N.**
**Ellen Shaffer**

**Conrad Alekantsrowski, L.V.N.**
**Carmen Melero, L.V.N.**
**Denise Hunt, M.S.N.**
**Christina Felts, N.P.**
**Mary E. Foley, R.N.**

**Louise Ogden**
**Lorraine R. Wiles**
**Elaine Adamson, M.P.H.**
**Barbara Engmann, R.N.**
**Ann Gonski**
**Ellen Roberts**
**Katherine Lambert**
**Catherine J. Dodd, R.N.**
**Priscilla Alexander**
**Sharyn Saslafsiesky**
**Gail Dolson, R.N.**
**Laura Campbell**
**Flora A. Hurley**
**Cherie V. James**
**Judith Kurtz**

**Aurora Garcia**
**Tracey Cosgrove**
**Sally Martin, C.C.S.W.**
**Alexis Gonzales**
**Velma V. Gaines**
**Lili T. Davis**
**Ruth O'Brien-McMullen, R.N.**
**Shelley Spiro, R.N.**
**Arlene Carden, R.N.**
**Robin Dushane**
**Laurie Carlson**
**Janet Veatch, R.N.**
**Barbara Burges, R.N.M.S.**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The policies governing San Francisco General affect every consumer and provider of health services in the City, yet there is little accountability to San Francisco taxpayers. No private hospital with General's size and influence operates without a board of trustees or directors. Indeed, no private organization of any kind with a $270 million annual budget—business, corporation, nonprofit foundation, whatever—operates without a governing board. Why does General?

As General bounces from one crisis to the next, with state and federal agencies threatening increasingly drastic actions, the weakness of the current management structure becomes clear to all. The Hospital and the Health Department need a commission, where public hearings can surface problems and issues in a timely fashion; where policies can be developed with the cooperation of private providers and consumers. The Health Commission will not be a watchdog meddling in day-to-day affairs, but an advocate for General, one providing continuity, stability and a rational decision-making process with regular rules and procedures.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Rolland Lowe, M.D.  
Past President, San Francisco Medical Society  
Robert Aaron, M.D.  
Robert Gross, M.D.  
Molly Coye, M.D.  
Robert Koshiyama, D.D.S.  
Maureen Katz, M.D.  
Yoshio Nakashima, D.D.S.  

James Cole, M.D.  
John Good, M.D.  
Jeff Sandler, M.D.  
Judy Keeven, M.D.  
Robert Dicker, D.D.S.  
Jeffrey Draizin, M.D.  
Gabriel Escobar, M.D.  
Brad Evans, M.D.  
Lars Erickson, M.D.  
Randy Yanda, M.D.  
Stephen Collins, M.D.  
Lewis Pepper, M.D.  
Mark Smith, M.D.  
Donald Goldmacher, M.D.  

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is obligated to ensure that all San Francisco communities have access to medical services. The AIDS crisis brought the health care needs of gay men to the forefront of public discussion. It brought home the importance of a Department flexible and responsive to quickly emerging problems and epidemics, one capable of quickly reallocating resources to dire community needs.

The general health needs of gay men and women, however, are largely unrecognized. The Health Commission will give our community the voice it needs in the health planning processes. It will ensure that the diversity of our City is represented in the consideration of these important issues.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club  
Sal Rosselli  
John Mehring  
Del Martin  
Donald Cataland  
Cleve Jones  
Randy Stallings  

Ron Huberman  
Richard Allman  
Jeff Jones  
Phyllis Lyon  
Debra Friedland  
Roberto Esteves

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Hispanics in San Francisco strongly support Proposition C, the Health Commission Charter Amendment.

Health is vital to the Latino Community of San Francisco. We are a younger population, with larger families and with special health needs, such as those of Central American refugees. In recent years, federal and state funding for health programs has decreased, leaving community health programs in a difficult financial situation. Recent changes in Medically Indigent Adult services have also negatively impacted our community.

In addition, the need for better and expanded bilingual medical services continues to be a top priority in San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition C.

Celso Ortiz  
Rafael Cedillos  
Maria Degado  
Roberto Hernandez  
Joanna Devito-Larson  
Rosa Maria Clos  
Susan Houston  
Arnell Rodrigues  
P. Braveman, M.D.  
Alfredo Rodrigues  
Sonia Melara  
Joseph Tanner  
Edgar Quiroz  
Angel Coutreras  

Roger Hernandez  
Tom Romero  
Raphael Talafarro  
Juanita DelCarlo  
Juan Pifarre  
Rudolph Mathias  
Rolph Hurtado  
Alfredo Rivas  
Valma Mondoza  
O. Bracker  
Ray Rivera  
Lorenzo Dill  
Yolanda Cameros  
Monica Asturias
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Health Commission

Sydney Furman
Carlos Castrillo
Leroy Jaquez
Estalla Lara
Ricardo Hernandez

Igor Kalinovsky, M.D.
Bayra Mattas
Andres Sendin
Consuelo Payes
Guadalupe Cuellar

Esperanza Martinez
Manuel Larez
Esperanza Echavarri
Stan Palomares-Criollos
Jene Alvin

Antonia Sacchetti
Maria Chavez
Maria Scioneux
Alicia Hopkinson
Clelia Fernandez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The chief opposition to Proposition C comes from two sources: The Chief Administrative Officer and the officials of the University of California Medical Center.

The CAO’s opposition is understandable. He simply doesn’t want to lose control of the Health Department and SF General.

UC’s opposition is more puzzling, until you realize that it receives $10–15 million from the City each year for staffing at General Hospital without a publicly reviewed contract! Why is UC afraid of having its relationship with General publicly scrutinized by a Health Commission?

Let’s clear the air. Vote YES on Proposition C.

Pattie Fong
Ina Dearman
Patrick Flanagan
Douglas Engmann

Ellen Roberts
Christopher Martin
Tom Moore
Henry Der

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

We support Proposition C.

Fred Ross
James O’Connor
Dale Carlson
Pamela Duffy
Gerald Yoachum
D.J. Soviero
Rosalind Wolf
Gordon Brownell
Jim Wachob
Steven Krefting
JoAnne Miller
Maura Kealey
Margaret O’Driscoll
Nicerita Revelo

Beatrice Patterson
Thomas Ambrogi
Arlo Hale Smith
Dian Blomquist
Thomas Moore
Peter Hanson
Jack Morrison
Mary Vail
Sally Osaki
Linda Post
Terrance Farr
Ken McEldowney
Sue Hestor
Willie Ge, D.D.S.
Agar Jaicks
John Holtzclaw

Paul Vacaralli
Al Cassiato
Alan Raznick
James Haas
Al Borvice
Eddie Webb
Joan Moulton
Russell Zellers
Stanley Shields
Richard Sevilla
Ann Daley
Dorothy Labudde
Dorice Murphy
Howard Strassner
Mark Davalos
Larry Griffin

Jay Wallace
Rob Waters
Kevin Malone
Jan Holloway
Norman Rolfe
Tom Jones
Barbara Halliday
Sandra Powell
Deborah Sarvis
Esther Marks
James Augustino
Sharon Johnson
Eileen Adams
Ruth Gravanis
Michael Heffer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Community clinics provide thousands of San Franciscans with access to essential primary health care and preventive health services. Yet, these community-based institutions, as well as the neighborhoods and people they represent, have been excluded from participation in health policy decision-making in San Francisco. Excluded, too, is any public debate on alternatives to hospital-based health delivery and financing systems that could prove cost-effective and could better serve the people of San Francisco.

Proposition C, The Health Commission Charter Amendment, offers a forum for public discussion of local health policy issues. By giving the neighborhoods and communities input into health policy decisions, the Health Commission will enable San Franciscans to create a new community of interest and new community of action in the area of health service delivery.

VOTE YES on PROPOSITION C.

San Francisco Community Clinic Consortium

Myles Dixon
George Dykstra
Susan Ehrlich
Patricia Franks
Debra Friedland
Kate Lambert

Mike Pincus
David Smith, M.D.
Marin Waukazo
Jerome West
Sophie Wong
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Commission will be of vital importance to the Asian community. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Dr. Yoshio Nakashima
Louis Hop Lee
Samuel Chung
David Yamakawa
Ernest Wu
Joe Jung
George Suncin
Sophie Wong
Pattie Fong
Willie Gee, D. D. S.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This proposal to put politics into the Department of Public Health by creating a “commission” to direct it is an example of the misguided philosophy of attacking governmental problems by throwing bureaucracy at them. It should be soundly defeated. Currently, the City's health officials report to one person, the Chief Administrative Officer, who can respond swiftly to any crisis and set consistent policy. The responsibility for the Department lies with the CAO, not a group of political appointees. When our Charter was adopted in 1932, the freeholders explained the rationale of giving the CAO management responsibility over the Health Department. The idea was “to provide reasonable safeguards AGAINST POLITICAL MANIPULATION.” (Emphasis added) Their report stated the office of CAO was designed to be “protected from political influence as largely as possible . . . ” and “it is intended that this officer shall be entirely independent in discharging the function of the office, and particularly, to be free from interference of the mayor, because the latter is subjected to political influence.” Although the Charter was adopted in 1932, its logic still makes powerful sense. Besides blurring lines of responsibility, this iniquitous proposal contradicts health management practices in California and the United States. In fact, the same idea was evaluated in 1971 by a committee established by the supervisors, which concluded that the commission concept, a “seemingly attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another bureaucratic layer in an already cluttered city administrative structure.” To paraphrase The Progress, the Muni is the best proof that “the presence of a commission does not guarantee good management.” Vote NO on Proposition C.

Supervisor 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.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The enactment of Proposition C would set the clock back on health care delivery in San Francisco to the 1920s. As proposed, the measure would almost exactly duplicate the system of Health Care abandoned by The City in 1932 because it had become corrupt, politicized and incapable of effectively responding to the growing challenges of modern health care administration.

In 1973 the Board of Supervisors itself considered and rejected a similar Health Commission option. The board’s reason was that commissions do not make effective management tools. “The Commission, seemingly an attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another layer in an already cluttered City administration structure.”

The commission concept also goes counter to sound health management practices. Earlier this year, a team of top Bay Area health care professionals was asked to identify the leading municipal hospitals in the country. None of the institutions identified uses a commission form of administration largely because commissions, while perhaps capable of overseeing some urban systems such as mass transit, have proven ineffective and cumbersome.

The argument has been advanced that a commission would allow for greater citizen input into the health department. The fact is that the Department of Health already has some 440 individuals serving on 27 Citizen Advisory Committees—more than with any other city department. The proposed seven member commission would be insufficient in both size and technical competence to do other than deal with the health care in San Francisco on a “crisis-to-crisis” basis.

As we move into the 21st Century, the administration of San Francisco’s health care systems will only become more challenging. A form of governance that proved inadequate 50 years ago and was rejected by the Board of Supervisors eleven years ago as inappropriate, is not the best way to provide for our city’s health care needs of the future. We urge you to vote “No” on Proposition C.

Dr. Frank Lewis, Chief of Staff, San Francisco General Hospital
Walter Newman, Overseer, UCSF
Yori Wada, UC Board of Regents
Dr. Frank Curry, Former Director of Public Health
Dr. Frank Sooy, Chancellor Emeritus, UCSF
Virginia Leishman, Director of Nursing, Laguna Honda Hospital

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

A vote for Proposition C is a vote to politicize health care in San Francisco. The authors of the 1932 City Charter foresaw this when they abolished the city’s highly politicized seven member health commission and placed the Department of Health under the jurisdiction of the Chief Administrative Officer. Proposition C would return San Francisco to the pre-1932 system of politicized health care management.

In writing the 1932 Charter, the authors recognized the need to balance executive authority by splitting it between the Mayor and the CAO. Departments, such as health, which were thought to be best managed if protected from direct political influence, were placed under the jurisdiction of the CAO, who is appointed for a fixed 10 year term to remove the office from political pressure.

Despite the occurrence of problems the system has worked well. San Francisco General has perhaps the best Trauma Unit in the country. The hospital’s AIDS unit is unquestionably the best and most humane in the nation.

Moving control of the city’s health care budget from the Chief Administrative Officer to the Executive will create a “strong mayor” type of government which the Charter was designed to prevent. Health commissioners would necessarily be beholden to the political factions or individuals which lobbied for their appointment and to the mayor who appoints them.

There are alternatives to a Health Commission. Several have already been recommended by a blue ribbon panel of health management experts appointed following the report on General Hospital. We believe these recommendations and perhaps others, including a variation on the health commission concept, deserve further study.

Proposition C would bring about a radical restructuring of government and health care delivery in San Francisco. Both issues are far too important to be decided hastily. We urge a No vote on Proposition C.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, President, Board of Supervisors
Florette White Pomeroy, Consultant
William K. Coblenz, Attorney
Thomas E. Horn, VP, Board of Trustees, War Memorial
J. Gary Shansby, Chairman of the Board, Shaklee Corporation
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission

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

I oppose Proposition C because:
1. It puts the Health Department under the control of politically appointed non-professionals. I cannot agree that this should be done. It brings in politics and throws out expertise.
2. It adds an extra layer of bureaucracy making government more expensive and management more difficult.

*Supervisor Richard Hongisto*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Your City Hall representatives would have you believe that by replacing our present Health System with a Health Commission, composed of seven members, at a recompense of $100 per month, will improve the services. Hogwash. Just another layer of government.

With a budget of $270 millions, 5000 employees would you put your faith in the hands of seven and still maintain the same Health Director?

What we need is a clean sweep of the present management; new faces; new ideas. The Charter provides for this, let's do it—"Now," not later.

*Vote NO on PROPOSITION C*

*Marguerite A. Warren*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

By creating a health commission for the Public Health Department, the city of San Francisco would create more problems rather than solve them.

Past experience has indicated a need to separate politics from health care. San Francisco would be turning the clock back to a situation in the 1920s when the city had a seven member commission appointed by the Mayor that oversaw the management of the Public Health Department. The delivery of effective health care was seriously compromised by the politicized department which was a direct consequence of the department's health commission.

For this reason, the citizens of San Francisco at that time passed a charter reform that removed the Health Department from the politically appointed commission and placed it in a newly created Chief Administrative Officer who would be secured against political pressures.

The creation of the Health Commission would take 40% of the budget of the Chief Administrative Officer's budget and place it under the control of a politically appointed Commission, thus negating the intent of the Chief Administrative Officer's Department which was created to administer departments that should be removed from political concerns.

Do not politicize San Francisco's health care. Vote No on Proposition C.

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, Public Health, and County Agricultural Department; Health Advisory Board; Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

- Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the

*Continued on page 82*
PROPOSITION D
Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement Board has complete authority to invest the funds of the Retirement System for city employees. The Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would remove the requirement that the Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California. Instead, the proposition would require the Retirement Board to make investments with the care and skill that a prudent person would make under similar circumstances.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the way the Retirement Board invests pension money. Instead of making only those investments which are legal for insurance companies, the Board would be able to make any investments that a prudent person would make.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Retirement Board to keep making only the same kind of investments which are legal for insurance companies.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-5 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.


Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, increase the cost of government. However, as a result of its authorizing additional flexibility for investments, earnings may be higher or lower than what could have occurred absent this amendment.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 63.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote YES on Proposition D.

The purpose of Proposition D is to clarify the investment responsibility of the Retirement Board and to add language expressly to comply with the recently enacted State Constitutional amendment on fiduciary standards for public pension plans (Proposition 21, June 1984).

Since 1932, the charter has referred to the Insurance Code as the guideline for pension investments.

Insurance Code investment requirements are unsuitable to current pension fund investment practices and severely restrict the ability of the Retirement Board to manage the fund to achieve the best possible investment return for the City and County of San Francisco and the members of the Retirement System.

The added new language will establish firm guidelines for the Retirement Board to discharge its responsibility as the fiduciary for the Retirement Fund. This new language will also serve as increased protection for members of the Retirement System by applying recognized fiduciary standards for which there is considerable statutory and case law.

In summary, the proposed charter amendment serve a dual purpose: it removes obsolete and ambiguous language and brings the Retirement System into compliance with the State Constitution. Both changes will enhance and improve the System's investment capabilities and the ability to achieve its goals and objectives.

Proposition D is endorsed and supported by the Retirement Board and the Board of Supervisors.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This is a worthwhile Charter amendment which updates obsolete and ambiguous provisions on how the Retirement Board can invest funds. It institutes standards consistent with a recent voter-approved amendment to the California Constitution. Investment practices have been refined dramatically in the past 50 years, and income and appreciation choices have increased tremendously. The investment professionals working for the Retirement System now are prevented from making the very most prudent investments possible, and City employees and taxpayers are, thus, prejudiced and hurt.

Present investment rules are based upon the State Insurance Code, which contravenes contemporary investment practices. Proposition D will give more latitude in making high-return investments, but will also retain vigorous guidelines on investment of Retirement System funds while increasing the protection of City employees. It will save money for taxpayers by enabling a better return on Retirement System assets. It’s logical. That’s why I recommend a “yes” vote.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

Proposition D

The retirement board shall discharge its duties with respect to the system with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with these matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like aims.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ______________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________ Apt. # _____

Telephone No. (required) ________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) ______________________________

Signature _____________________________________________
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?

YES 264

NO 265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would provide that the City contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee’s death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the health care fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Bill Maher.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs and present membership data of the Health Service System, in excess of $990,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 67.
Surviving Spouse Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This charter amendment calls for extending a limited measure of aid from the City and County of San Francisco for the health care of the surviving spouse of an active or retired City employee.

Under existing statute, the City and County and its employees, active or retired, share the cost of health care for the employee, their spouse and children. However, upon the death of the employee, the City and County’s share of payments to the health care system stops.

Thus, the surviving spouse is compelled to pick up the entire cost for the health care plan while struggling to survive on a reduced family income and, at the same time, contend with ever increasing medical/hospital expenses and everyday living costs for themselves and eligible family dependents.

Proposition E will allow the City and County to continue paying its share into the health care system and not force the surviving spouse and eligible family dependents to assume the entire financial burden for health care payments.

Since the number of surviving spouses affected is very small, less than 1400, the cost to the taxpayer for the City and County is minimal.

The changes proposed by Proposition E should have been made many years ago; it is long overdue. We urge you to support this important measure.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Justice tempered with compassion. VOTE YES. Surviving spouses of City workers receive an automatic 50% cut in retirement pay upon the death of their partners. Why further burden this small group by withdrawing subsidy for health care?

The Retirement System actuary has officially confirmed that the average pension check for this group is $300.00 per month; incidentally, below the nationally quoted poverty level.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by William T. Reed, Chairman Legislative Committee, Retired Employees City & County of San Francisco Helen McAtee, Chairperson Philip Kearney, President, and retired manager of the Health Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Health Service Board which administers the health benefits provided to active and retired employees and their dependents fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the surviving spouse upon the death of a retired employee.

This financial problem is especially acute because a surviving spouse’s pension is cut by 50% at the death of the employee and because of the high cost of medical insurance. Medical cost increases have outpaced general inflation rates over the last three (3) years by about two to one.

We urge your “YES” vote on Proposition “E” on the basis of need and equity.

Abraham Bernstein, M.D., President Health Service Board of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Surviving spouses of city employees need this for a relatively comfortable widowhood. Let’s extend a small measure of consideration to those who are left on their own.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Proposition E if approved would require the city to subsidize the health premiums of the surviving spouses of non-uniformed city employees. The cost to the city would amount to $990,000 per year and give city employees a benefit that is not normally enjoyed by workers in private industry.

The majority of private employees have health plans that allow surviving spouses to be members of such plans but the employer does not subsidize the premiums of these survivors in anyway. Being permitted to join a group plan that provides comprehensive coverage at a reasonable rate is a sufficient benefit in and of itself.

If this amendment is approved it will violate the spirit of the Charter provision that sets city employee salaries and benefits at the average of that which prevails in the metropolitan Bay Area. We believe in fair treatment and compensation for city employees and our current rules provide exactly that.

Vote No on Proposition E.
John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

The city and county, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.423, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, 6, 1984 shall be effective July 1, 1973 1985.
Employee Death Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?

YES 267

NO 268

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, who is a member of the Retirement System is entitled to a death benefit of six months salary if he or she dies, regardless of cause, before retirement. The benefit is paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would provide that if an officer or employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, is injured through external and violent means in the course of employment and the employee dies within 180 days of the injury, an additional benefit of 12 months salary would be paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to pay an additional benefit of 12 months salary to a city employee who dies from an injury caused by external and violent means in the course of employment.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to provide an additional death benefit to these city employees who die from external and violent means in the course of employment.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the number of employees and their respective salary rates which qualify for payment under the provisions of this proposed amendment. Based on experience to date, the cost of this additional amount should not be substantial.”

TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 69.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F provides a small compensation for the survivor of a city employee (non Police or Fire) killed in the line of duty. Let's agree to this minor expenditure for the survivors of those who have died in city service.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Only rarely is a city employee killed in the line of duty, but death can come with fierce suddenness.

Two Muni workers were crushed by cable car machinery in 1978; the following year, two Water Department employees were murdered at the Lake Merced Pumping Station; and in March 1981, a Hetch Hetchy lineman fell to his death.

For the families of the vast majority of city workers, there is little protection when death comes. Police officers and fire fighters already have special death benefits.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Proposition F is designed to correct a serious inequity on behalf of miscellaneous members of the Retirement System who are killed in line of duty or who die as a result of a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury.

Under current charter provisions, a designated beneficiary of a member who dies in the course of employment from any cause receives the member's contributions to the system, plus six months' salary.

Proposition F focuses only on those members who are killed in the line of duty or who die within 180 days from a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury. Beneficiaries of such members will be accorded an additional insurance benefit of twelve months' salary.

The payment of additional compensation to a designated beneficiary will be subject to the independent hearing officer process as set forth in the City charter.

Proposition F is fair and equitable and, based on actuarial projections, the cost is minimal.

Proposition F is sponsored and endorsed by the Retirement Board, unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, and strongly supported by Mayor Dianne Feinstein.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

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

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

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

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

(Continued on page 84)
**Police Probationary Period**

**PROPOSITION G**

Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?

**YES** 270

**NO** 271

---

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** Police officers entering the Police Department serve a one-year probationary period. During the first 32 weeks, the police officer goes through the police training program. After successfully completing training, the officer is then assigned to regular police duties. The Police Department has 20 weeks to evaluate the officer while on regular police duty. After this 20 week period, the probation is complete.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition G would extend the probationary period of the police officer to one year after the completion of the training. In no event would it extend the probationary period beyond 84 weeks from the date of entry. Any termination for breach of duty or misconduct would require charges and a hearing before the Police Commission.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the probationary period for a police officer to be extended to one year after completing the police training course but not to exceed 84 weeks.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want the probationary period for a police officer to remain one year after the date of entry into the department.

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “G”**

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinar, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

**Controller’s Statement on “G”**

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

---

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Your YES vote for this amendment will enable the Police Department to provide more effective police services by ensuring that after officers graduate from the Academy and complete a field training program, an adequate probationary evaluation period exists to determine an officer's fitness to perform police duties. Society demands much from its police officers. As the nature of police work has become increasingly complex, training and performance evaluation functions must meet the needs of an ever-evolving profession.

Great expenditure of time and money are invested in training police officers. Presently, if a recruit is not deemed ready for duty, the probationary period can be completed during any retraining, thus making it difficult and costly to determine ultimate fitness for duty.

By voting YES, you will give the Chief of Police time necessary to adequately train and evaluate an officer's performance and to better ensure quality police services.

The Police Department has met and conferred with the Police Officers' Association regarding this amendment and has obtained that organization's support for its passage.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition G.

In recent years, because San Francisco has had the financial strength to do so, we've steadily expanded the size of the Police Department.

It is now the largest ever, with 1987 officers.

More and more officers are being assigned to our neighborhoods on beats and in patrol cars. We want the best officers possible.

That's why Proposition G is so important. It will give the Department greater ability to screen out officers who do not measure up to the strict standards of professionalism this city demands.

Proposition G will extend the probation period for a new officer to one complete year following completion of his or her field training.

Presently, probation starts when an officer is first inducted into the Department, before 18 weeks of class work in the City's outstanding Police Academy and another 14 weeks of field training.

As strenuous as the class work and the training may be, the real test of an officer is on the street.

That's where his or her coolness, competence and compassion—in fact, all the qualities that this city wants in a superior police department—can be observed and tested.

Proposition G will give the department a full year to evaluate an officer in uniform and on the job.

Those who don't measure up can be dismissed after a departmental hearing. Protected will be the City's rightful concern that our police officers can truly be described as the City's finest.

Proposition G is a common-sense measure, sought by the Chief of Police, that will strengthen the San Francisco Police Department. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Police commanders need more time to evaluate the recruits' "street" performance. Proposition G does that by extending the on-the-job probationary period up to one year. For the sake of our children, neighbors and all San Franciscans, I want to be sure that a police officer is fully competent from a practical standpoint, not merely because of a classroom perspective. Therefore, I support Proposition G, and I urge you to vote for it, too.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Police Motorcycle Pay

PROPOSITION H

Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?

YES 274
NO 275

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and who are assigned to the Traffic Division get bonus pay. Police officers who ride motorcycles as part of their job, but who are assigned to duties other than traffic, do not get bonus pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would give all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job to get the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want only those San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and are assigned to the Traffic Division to get bonus pay.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current rates of pay, staffing and assignments by the police department, the cost of government would be increased by approximately $74,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Honda Motorcycle Unit of the San Francisco Police Department has, because of antiquated charter language, been denied payment of the hazard pay which is currently given the two-wheel motorcycle officers in the Traffic Division.

Because the primary function of the Honda Motorcycle Unit is crime fighting and not traffic enforcement, the word “traffic” must be deleted from the charter in order to compensate equally all officers who perform hazardous motorcycle duty.

Please join us in voting YES for this very fair charter amendment.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

In 1970, the San Francisco Police Department created a unit of light weight motorcycles to patrol Golden Gate Park and the beaches surrounding the City. In 1977 these duties were drastically changed to counteract rising street crimes around the Western Addition. Neighborhood associations, seeing the effectiveness of the unit, also requested additional patrols by these motorcycle officers. Since 1977 the Honda Unit (as it is known now) has been assigned to virtually every neighborhood in the City to reduce purse snatches, “red light” robberies, drag racing, and street narcotics traffic, along with demonstrations, marches, parades, and sporting events all over the City.

Also occurring since 1977 have been injuries to these highly visible, highly vulnerable motorcycle officers. Some of these injuries include one officer hit head on, and another officer suffering a leg broken by an auto which ran a red light. There have been numerous officers struck by other vehicles causing injuries, and injuries due to other road hazards (oil slicks, pothole etc.). These have increased sharply since the Honda Unit has been assigned to primarily street patrol. One officer was shot twice while patrolling the Western Addition for purse snatches.

It is obvious that these officers are no longer “just” patrolling the parks and beaches as they were initially intended, but are now assigned to patrol the streets of the most crime-ridden areas of the City combating street crimes and enforcing traffic laws. These officers on prior occasions have requested Motorcycle Hazard Pay (which traffic enforcement two-wheel motorcycle officers already receive) for their patrol of these neighborhoods and streets on the two-wheel motorcycles but have been denied because of outdated wording in the Charter. Passage of this amendment would correct this inequity.

*Al Casciato*
President, S.F.P.O.A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

*All* police officers who ride motorcycles in the course of duty face special danger and deserve the premium pay already allowed for motorcycle traffic officers.

**Supervisor Richard Hongisto**

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

A police officer on a two-wheeler is often the first on the scene of a major crime or emergency. Day after day, there is no more hazardous duty for our police.

Whether on a motorcycle in pursuit of a felon on city streets, or on a motorbike on patrol in the remote areas of the City's parklands, an officer lives with danger. Because they can cut through traffic, the two-wheelers often are first to arrive at a shooting or bank robbery or car crash.

The City Charter has long recognized the dangers inherent in this essential police work and has provided hazard-pay for motorcycle officers of the Traffic Division. Proposition H simply extends hazard-pay to the 17 or so officers on the equally perilous motorbike detail.

The amount of money involved is small—only $178 a month for each officer. Proposition H is small recognition of the dangers the police daily face in the line of duty. Vote YES on Proposition H.

**Dianne Feinstein**
Mayor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Military & Social Spending Initiative

PROPOSITION I

(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco does not have an official position on whether federal taxes should be used for certain kinds of defense spending.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I says the Board of Supervisors must inform the President and certain other federal officials that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether they want their tax dollars used for certain kinds of "excessive military expenditures", as defined in the measure. Proposition I also says the City’s Chief Administrative Officer must publish an annual report on the amount of federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents, what portion of these taxes are used for military spending, and what portion are used for social or human needs. The Board of Supervisors would appoint a seven-member Citizens’ Advisory Committee to oversee the preparation of the report.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you think federal officials should be told that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending. You also want the City to publish an annual report on how federal tax dollars collected from San Francisco residents are spent.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t think taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending, and you don’t want the City to publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents.

How “I” Got on Ballot
On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition relating to military and social expenditures had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The proponents of the petition had gathered 12,271 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 2. The proponents are officially listed as G.C. Barnes, L.J. Crowe, H.J. Hobin and R.A. Wall.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,304 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

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

"Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time but should not be substantial."

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I
APPEARS ON PAGE 75.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This initiative should be passed because it educates people about excessive military spending and sends a clear message to the Federal Government that people want a choice as to how their taxes are spent.

Homer Hobi
Chairperson
The Humanist Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why waste taxpayers' money for a handful of misguided individuals?
City government is mandated to govern local citizens affairs.

Martin Eng
School Board Candidate

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

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

Section 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following terms are defined:
(a) Excessive military expenditures: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is destined for research, development, and production of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons; research, development, and production of outer space laser-beam technology weapons (popularly known as "star-war" weapons); research, development, and production of chemical and biological warfare; military aid, both overt and covert, to undemocratic and/or repressive governments (governments that violate the basic human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948 by the United Nations).
(b) Social or human needs: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is used for education, housing, health and human services, public transportation, and the arts.
(c) San Francisco taxpayer: any individual who pays federal taxes and who reports his or her principal place of residence within the San Francisco city limits; and any corporation who is considered by the Internal Revenue Service as residing in San Francisco.
(d) portion of revenues in 3(a) budgeted for social or human needs;
(e) average individual tax contribution;
(f) average individual tax contribution allocated to (1) excessive military expenditures and (2) social needs.

The Board of Supervisors shall appoint a Citizen's Advisory Committee every year to oversee the preparation of the report and to ensure that its findings are accurate and impartial. The Citizen's Advisory Committee shall consist of seven members, at least three of whom shall be volunteers from renowned Peace organizations in San Francisco.

The report shall use the most current figures available from the federal government at the time of publication, citing the sources for the computations. If the necessary tax and budgetary breakdowns for San Francisco were not available, the report shall base itself upon tax revenue and budgetary figures for the entire nation (or subdivision thereof) and produce accurate extrapolations.

The Chief Administrative Officer shall publish the report in the two newspapers of largest circulation in San Francisco, no earlier than 14 days before but no later than the normal deadline for the filing of federal income taxes for individuals.

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

(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?

YES 283

NO 284

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco has no policy about the investment of pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco and its agencies not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa. This would be the official policy until Black people are given full political and civil rights by the government of South Africa.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want it to be the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City and County of San Francisco to have an official policy against investing pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

How "J" Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition on South African investment policy had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Julianne Malveaux, the official proponent of the petition drive, had gathered 11,404 signatures which she turned in to the Registrar on August 8.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,520 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, investment income may be affected in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount.”

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We support removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa because we believe the city of San Francisco should not support the reprehensible institution of apartheid. Non-whites in South Africa are denied freedom of association, freedom of mobility, freedom of speech, and voting rights. San Franciscans support this inequality when city pension funds are invested in companies that do business with South Africa.

This investment is also a very risky investment since any civil unrest in South Africa may lower the value of the investment. Other investment possibilities will equal or exceed current yields on the pension portfolio.

We support this initiative because we support equal rights for all, and because we believe in prudent investment of city pension funds.

San Franciscans for Responsible Investments
Julianne Malveaux, Chair
Essie Mornen, Co-Chair
Henry Clark, Co-Chair
Alto Hale Smith, Treasurer

Hon. Sala Burton
Hon. Harry Britt
Hon. Doris Ward
Hon. Richard Hongisto
Hon. Nancy Walker
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Louis Hopp Lee
Kim Corsaro
Roberto Hernandez
Bruce St. Cyr
Tim Lennon
Beatrice Eisman
Joan Apodaca
Wardell Jackson
Susan Englander
Henry Der
Sue Hestor
Ida Strickland
Bradford Paul
Daniel Moses
National Labor Relations
Board Union Local 20

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

By supporting Proposition J, San Franciscans join citizens from fourteen other cities, including Washington, D.C., Boston, and Berkeley, in removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa. Our support strikes a blow against the apartheid policy that has denied Black and non-white people equal rights in South Africa.

Removing pension funds from South Africa makes good economic sense. International investment advisors recommend against such investment because of the frailty of the South African political situation. Significantly, none of the cities that have divested funds from South Africa have had lower earnings since divestment.

It is both morally just and fiscally sound to vote YES for Proposition J!

Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Economics
S.F. State University
Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud that we were the first state in the nation to vote to sell from our public pension fund portfolio all investments in firms doing business in South Africa. Since the passage of this landmark legislation, it has been our experience that divestiture makes not only a strong moral statement against apartheid, but divestiture has proven to have had no negative impact on our pension earnings.

I urge San Franciscans to give serious consideration to both the moral and the financial arguments as you consider divestiture as a policy of your great city.

Michael Dukakis
Governor, Massachusetts
Submitted by John Burke
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South African Investment Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For over a decade individuals and institutional investors, including local and state governments, universities, foundations, churches, Taft-Hartley pension funds and health and welfare plans have refused to invest in, and divested from corporations and financial institutions economically supporting apartheid in South Africa.

They are investing and earning competitive returns in housing, small business, alternative energy, and other socially productive investments which create employment and prevent capital from being exported to South Africa.

It is fiduciarily irresponsible to risk beneficiaries' pension assets by investing in companies in South Africa. Many trade and corporate risk analysts have recommended no investment exposure in South Africa. The Rockefeller Study Commission on U.S. policy toward Southern Africa, recently recommended no new corporate investments in that white, minority ruled country.

Vote to create jobs, housing and small business in your community, not apartheid in South Africa. Vote YES on Proposition J.

John Harrington, President Working Assets Money Fund

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

“For the sake of the children of all South Africans, black and white, for God's sake, for the sake of world peace, the international community must take action, it must exert pressure on South Africa—political pressure, diplomatic pressure and above all, economic pressure.” (Bishop Desmond Tutu, General Secretary-South African Council of Churches, 1981)

The apartheid system continues because of Western support. The South African Council of Churches has said “foreign investors must know they are investing to buttress one of the most vicious systems since Nazism.” As members of the international religious community, we can no longer let others make decisions which contradict all that we believe in. We urge San Franciscans to vote yes on Proposition J as a specific, responsible way to express their moral rejection of apartheid.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I support Proposition J and encourage a statewide effort to remove pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON “J”

STATEMENT BY UNION OFFICIALS

The United Nations General Assembly declared South African apartheid “a crime against humanity”; and that investment in South Africa “encourages the apartheid policies of that country”.

Representatives of several hundred million unionists, meeting under UN -ILO auspices, called for the elimination of stocks of companies investing in South Africa, from pension funds.

As unionists and human rights advocates we support this measure.

Rev. Cecil Williams
Dr. Thomas Ambrogi
Dr. Norman Leach
Rev. Glenda Hope
Rev. Jean Richardson
Rev. Robert Cromey
Rev. Stanley Stefancic
Rev. James Claitor
Rev. Pamela White
First Congregational Church
Rev. Kenneth Westray
Rev. Preliono Walker
Rev. Charles Lewis
Rev. Matthew Fong
Rev. Donald Stuart
Rev. Lloyd Wake

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Lia Belli
Democratic Candidate,
State Senate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Committee for International Support of Trade Union Rights

Charles Lamb
Anthony L. Ramos
Jack Goldberger
Curtis Mc Clain
Frank Souza
Stanley M. Smith
Mary Anne Petersen
Timothy J. Twomey
Walter L. Johnson
Jack Henning
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

To protect American interests and to halt the spread of Communist influence into South Africa, responsible action is needed to end legally-required racial segregation and to reasonably extend voting rights.

Proposition J is an important step towards a moderate solution of the South African problem.

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman

Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee

Todd Rous
Republican State Senate Nominee

Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

WARNING TO VOTERS

Disregard any self-serving statements by Peter Ashe, Meta Stanley, and their controversial Retirement Board in connection with Proposition J.

The Retirement Board has done more than just aid South Africa by its investment policies.

The Retirement Board has made serious investment errors, produced poor investment yields, and run up market value investment portfolio losses of $160,852,320 (as of 3/30/84) with Prudential-Bache.

One Retirement Board “success” was the purchase of 10,000 shares of Citicorp for $3,473,320. The shares on 3/30/84 were worth $340,000 (90% loss).

Mike Garza
Robert Silvestri
Max Woods

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Rainbow Coalition and all members, support this initiative. Stop investments of San Francisco pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa.

Support Human Rights. People have a right to know that their pension funds are being used to support a racist, repressive, apartheid system, that denies basic human and civil rights to 24 million Africans. We have a right to know that a Black man can be detained in the South African penal system for as long as two years, for not having identification. That Black people there are denied the right to vote, buy or sell land, and the right to live or work where they choose. Support Human Rights. Vote in favor of prop. J.

Gale White
African American of the Rainbow
Rev. Howard Gloyd
Northern California Chairman
The Rainbow Coalition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco CISPES supports the removal of city pension fund investments from firms that profit from apartheid.

The government of South Africa, like the government of El Salvador, denies its people the most basic human rights: freedom from arbitrary arrest and torture; freedom of speech and association; and the right to a decent standard of living.

In 1983, San Franciscans said no to military aid to El Salvador. In 1984, let us say no to investments in South Africa.

San Francisco Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Apartheid continues to be used to enslave black working people in South Africa. International labor has consistently condemned apartheid, and agrees that divestment from South Africa is an effective means of pressure.

David Aroner, Executive Director
SEIU Local 535
Timothy Twomey, Secretary-Treasurer
Hospital and Institutional Workers
Local 250
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director
United Public Employees Local 390/400
SEIU

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For the Black majority, apartheid in South Africa means no right to vote, unionize or speak out. Those who resist are murdered, tortured and imprisoned. Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, has been imprisoned for over twenty years. Apartheid is fascism!

U.S. companies investing in South Africa profit from low wages paid to Black workers, and play a key role in keeping apartheid alive. Say NO to apartheid and racism—Vote YES on Prop J.

Henry Clark, Candidate for Congress, Fifth Congressional District
Gloria La Riva
All-People’s Congress
Johnnie Stevens
Southern Africa Freedom Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Joint Council of the Service Employees International Union has unanimously endorsed this proposal. The Union took this action because of the economic oppression of citizens by the South African Government, because of the termination of trade union rights and the arrest of union leaders, and because of the moral “Crime against humanity” of Apartheid.

Timothy J. Twomey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

South African apartheid is condemned the world over. Even the Reagan Administration expresses opposition.

Yet South Africa and apartheid continue to flourish, subjecting all non-whites to the vilest humiliations, discrimination, and exploitation.

San Francisco supports apartheid through our investment of municipal pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. By their very presence there, these companies maintain the status quo. Otherwise, the ruling white minority would not welcome these investments! We allow apartheid to continue, despite all the rhetoric we direct at South Africa.

San Franciscans can make responsible investments elsewhere. Voting YES on J, we join other cities in cutting the taproot—foreign finance—which allows the horrors of South Africa to go on, and on, and on. . . . End it! Vote YES, against apartheid!

Executive Committee
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
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Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY A PROPOSITION OF ISSUING REVENUE BONDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.312 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $104,000,000 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, FINANCING, IMPROVING AND DEVELOPING WATER DEPARTMENT FACILITIES; AND CONSOLIDATING SAID SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 1984.

WHEREAS, Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the Board of Supervisors in each instance, the Public Utilities Commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities of the San Francisco Water Department subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of Charter Section 7.300, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, by resolution No. 84-0363 adopted July 24, 1984, pursuant to said Section 7.312, has recommended that the Board of Supervisors, by resolution, submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held for that purpose on November 6, 1984, the proposition of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, as it read on June 5, 1984, and Charter Section 7.312 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission in said resolution 84-0363;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

Section 1. A special revenue bond election is hereby ordered and will be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 6, 1984, at which election there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County the proposition of issuing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of providing funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, all as set forth in the following proposition:

Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds

Shall the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to Charter Section 7.312 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing additions, betterments and improvements to the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system, including filtration and treatment works and plants, reservoirs and other water supply, storage and distribution facilities, lands and equipment necessary or convenient for the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system?

Section 2. Said revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 (herein called the "Bonds") are proposed to be issued to finance improvements to an enterprise (herein called the "Enterprise") which is herein defined to be the City and County of San Francisco municipal water supply, storage and distribution systems of the San Francisco Water Department, including all of the presently existing municipal water system of the City and County and all additions, betterments, extensions and improvements thereto. Said existing water systems and the proposed improvements thereto shall constitute a single, unified integrated enterprise, and the revenues therefrom shall be pledged to the payment of the bonds. It is hereby found and determined that said municipal water system is necessary to enable the City and County to exercise its municipal powers and functions, namely, to furnish sufficient water for any present or future beneficial use of the City and County.

(a) The purpose for which the Bonds are proposed to be issued is to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, including any expenses incident thereto or connected therewith.

(b) The estimated costs of the acquisition, construction, financing, improvement and development is $104,000,000. Said estimated cost includes all costs and expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, engineering, inspection, legal and fiscal agents' fees, cost of the revenue bond election and of the issuance of the Bonds, bond reserve funds, and working capital and bond interest estimated to accrue during the construction period and for a period of not to exceed 12 months after completion of construction.

(c) The maximum principal amount of the Bonds proposed to be issued is $104,000,000.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at said special revenue bond election the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution, and designates and refers to said proposition in the form of ballot hereinafter prescribed for use at said election.

(a) Said special revenue bond election shall be held and conducted, and the votes thereafter canvassed and the returns thereof made, and the result thereof ascertained and determined as herein provided; and in all particulars not described by this resolution, said special election shall be held and the votes canvassed pursuant to law for general municipal elections in the City and County and pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 52 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) All persons qualified to vote at municipal elections in the City and County upon the date of the election herein provided for shall be qualified to vote upon the proposition submitted at said special revenue bond election.

(c) Said special revenue bond election is hereby consolidated with the general municipal election to be held in the City and County on November 6, 1984, pursuant to the Charter of the City and County. The precincts, polling places and officers of election for said special revenue bond election shall be the same as those established
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and designated for said general municipal election. Reference is hereby made to the notice of election by the Registrar of Voters setting forth the precincts, polling places and officers of election for said general municipal election, to be published on or about October 15, 1984 for more particular description of said precincts, polling places and officers of election.

(d) The ballot used at said general municipal election and said special revenue bond election hereby consolidated thereunder shall have printed thereon, in addition to all other matters required by law, the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution.

(e) Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballots are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

If and to the extent that voting machines are used at said special revenue bond election such machines shall be so arranged that any qualified voter may vote for said proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "YES" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on board, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for said proposition, and may vote against it by pulling down a lever over the word "NO" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote against said proposition. The statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material used in voting machines shall read substantially as follows:

$104,000,000 San Francisco Water Department Revenue Bonds.

Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with law.

Section 4. If the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution shall be authorized by the qualified voters of the City and County by the votes of a majority of all the voters voting on said proposition, the Bonds may be issued and sold for the purpose set forth in Section 2 of this resolution.

The Bonds are to be revenue bonds, payable exclusively from the revenues of the Enterprise and such other funds from any source as may be legally available for such purpose and may be used by the City and County for such purpose without incurring indebtedness. The Bonds are not to be secured by the taxing power of the City and County, and shall be issued under Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County. The principal of and interest on the Bonds and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof shall not constitute a debt of the City and County, nor shall any of such funds be transferred to the City and County for any purpose issues other than the payment of the principal of and interest on the Bonds, but shall be used only for the purpose of building and equipping and maintaining the Enterprise.

The Bonds shall not constitute or evidence indebtedness of the City and County but shall constitute and evidence only an indebtedness of the Public Utilities Commission payable solely out of revenues received by the Public Utilities Commission from San Francisco Water Department facilities operated or controlled by it. The Bonds shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in Section 6.401 of the Charter.

Section 5. This resolution shall be printed in the voters' pamphlet and mailed to each registered voter pursuant to Section 9.105 of the Charter of the City and County.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C, Continued from page 61

bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, a deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy or other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

The department of public works shall have powers and duties relating to street traffic, subject to the laws relating thereto, as follows:

(a) to cooperate with and assist the police department in the promotion of
traffic safety education;
(b) to receive, study and give prompt attention to complaints relating to street design or traffic devices or the absence thereof;
(c) to collect, compile, analyze and interpret traffic and parking data and to analyze and interpret traffic accident information;
(d) to engage in traffic research and traffic planning; and
(e) to cooperate for the best performance of these functions with any department and agency of the city and county and the state as may be necessary.

The department shall submit to the traffic bureau of the police department, for its review and recommendation, all proposed plans relating to street traffic control devices; provided, however, that the bureau may waive submission and review of plans of particular devices designated by it. Failure of the said traffic bureau to submit to the department its recommendation on any proposed plan within fifteen (15) days after receipt shall be considered an automatic approval of said traffic bureau. The department shall not, with respect to any traffic control devices, implement such plan until the recommendation of the traffic bureau has been reviewed or until the fifteen (15) day period has elapsed.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county upon paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendation of the chief of the department.

Department of Public Health, which shall be administered by a director of health, who shall be a regularly licensed physician or surgeon in the State of California, with not less than 10 years' practice in his profession immediately preceding his appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician or surgeon requirement may be waived by the board of supervisors. He shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The chief administrative officer shall have power to appoint and to remove an assistant director of public health for hospital services, who shall be responsible for the administrative and business management of the institutions of the department of public health, including, but not limited to, the San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Home, Kaiser Health Home, and the Emergency Hospital Service, and who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of assistant director of public health for hospital services shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the institutions of the department of public health.

The director of public health shall have power to appoint and remove an administrator of San Francisco General Hospital who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of administrator shall be held only by a physician or hospital administrator who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the San Francisco General Hospital.

Health Advisory Board. There is hereby created a health advisory board of seven members, three of whom shall be physicians and one dentist, all regularly certificated. Members of the board shall serve without compensation. They shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer for terms of four years; provided, however, that those first appointed shall classify themselves by lot so that the terms of one physician and one lay member shall expire in 1933, 1934 and 1935, respectively, and the term of one member in 1936.

Such board shall consider and report on problems and matters under the jurisdiction of the department of public health and shall consult, advise with and make recommendations to the director of health relative to the functions and affairs of the department. The recommendations of such board shall be made in writing to the director of health and to the chief administrative officer.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center.

If in the election of June 3, 1930 November 6, 1934 two or more propositions amending section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

PART TWENTY-ONE: HEALTH COMMISSION

3.695 Composition of Department; Commission

The public health department shall consist of a health commission, a director of public health and such employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter. The department shall be under the management of a health commission consisting of seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor. Said commission shall have less than a majority of direct providers of health care. Direct providers of health care shall mean all
health professionals and others whose "primary current activity" is the provision of patient care or the administration of facilities or institutions which provide patient care. The term of each member of the commission shall be four years, commencing at twelve o'clock, noon, on the 15th day of January in the year 1985; provided, that the respective terms of office of those first appointed shall be as follows: two for four years, two for three years, two for two years, and one for one year. Vacancies occurring on said commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of each of said members shall be filled by the mayor. No commissioner may serve more than two consecutive terms or a total of eight years.

The compensation of each commissioner shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month. The commissioners shall annually elect one of their members president. They shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the governance of the commission.

3.696 Director of Public Health; Other Executives

The health commission shall appoint a director of public health who shall serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The director of public health shall be a regularly licensed physician in the State of California, with not less than five years' experience in public health administration immediately preceding his or her appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician requirement may be waived by the health commission. The director of public health shall be the chief executive of the commission and shall, subject to the approval of the commission, manage all operations under its jurisdiction. The director shall have power to appoint and remove a deputy director for operations, a deputy director for community health programs, an administrator for San Francisco General Hospital and an administrator for Laguna Honda Hospital. The administrators of San Francisco General Hospital and of Laguna Honda Hospital shall have power to appoint and remove associate administrators to the extent such positions are created by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

These positions shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter and shall be held by persons who possess the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the divisions and institutions of the department. However, any person who has civil service status in any of the above positions on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have such status under the civil service provisions of this charter. All positions in the department legally authorized shall be continued and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.697 Powers and Duties

The health commission shall manage and control the city and county hospitals, emergency medical services, and all matters pertaining to the preservation, promotion, and protection of the lives, health and mental health of the inhabitants of the city and county, except where this charter specifically grants that power to another department. It may also determine the nature and character of public health nuisances and provide for their abatement.

The commission shall inspect the sanitary conditions of the municipal institutions of the city and county, including jails and all public buildings; of the disposition of the dead; of the disposition of garbage, offal and offensive substances.

The commission shall be a policy-making and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in section 3.500 of this charter. The commission shall have the power to establish and make appointments to advisory committees as it shall deem necessary.

8.107 Suspension and Removal

Any elected officer, and any member of the civil service commission, health commission, or public utilities commission or school board may be suspended by the mayor and removed by the board of supervisors for official misconduct, and the mayor shall appoint a qualified person to discharge the duties of the office during the period of suspension. On such suspension, the mayor shall immediately notify the supervisors thereof in writing and the cause therefor, and shall present written charges against such suspended officer to the board of supervisors at or prior to its next regular meeting following such suspension, and shall immediately furnish copy of same to such officer, who shall have the right to appear with counsel before the board in his defense. Hearing by the supervisors shall be held not less than five days after the filing of written charges. If the charges are deemed to be sustained by not less than a three-fourths vote of all members of the board, the suspended officer shall be removed from office; if not so sustained, or if not acted on by the board of supervisors within thirty (30) days after the filing of written charges, the suspended officer shall thereby be reinstated.

The mayor must immediately remove from office any elective official convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, and failure of the mayor so to act shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part.

Any appointee of the mayor, exclusive of civil service, health, recreation and park, and public utilities commissioners, and members of the school board, may be removed by the mayor. Any nominee or appointee of the mayor whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, except the chief administrative officer and the controller, as in this charter otherwise provided, may be removed by a majority of such board and with the concurrence of the mayor. In each case, written notice shall be given or transmitted to such appointee of such removal, the date of effectiveness thereof, and the reasons therefor, a copy of which notice shall be printed at length in the journal of proceedings of the board of supervisors, together with such reply in writing as such official may make. Any appointee of the mayor or the board of supervisors guilty of official misconduct or convicted of crime involving moral turpitude must be removed by the mayor or the board of supervisors, as the case may be, and failure of the mayor or any supervisor to take such action shall constitute official misconduct on his or their part.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F — Continued from page 69

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

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

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

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

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

For the purposes of the retirement system and-of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

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

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

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

B (b) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection G (g) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection F (f) of this section shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this subsection B (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this subsection B (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said subsection F (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of sixty years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty years, computed under subsection G (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection G (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed seventy-five percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection G (e) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within thirty (30) days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of sixty-five (65) years may elect, without right to revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month upon retirement after thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty years, and provided further that as to any member within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for
each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

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

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

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

(1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection E (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

F (f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system,
provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least ten years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000), he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, ninety 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus one and two-thirds (1/2/3) percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

G (g) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:
(1) Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous officer or employee.
(2) Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member of either of such departments to employment entitled to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contribution standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either of such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.
(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.
(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.
(5) The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and services rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefore shall be required of the city and county.
H (h) All payments provided under this section shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:
(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7-1/2) percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in sections 8.509(c) and 8.509(f).
(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection G (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual ac-

counts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deduced after said date.
(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.
(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection H (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), subsection H (h), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodic actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said value shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodic actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be
made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision § (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of thirty 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provision of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

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

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

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

(l) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections B (b), c (e), F (f) and (j) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(M) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983.

(n) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.584-5 Death Benefit

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

(a) If no benefit is payable under § (b) of this section:

1. Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(b) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of § 8.584-2, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years.

If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this § (b), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this § (b) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under § (a) of this section, the amount of said benefit payable under § (a) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this § (b) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

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

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

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in § (a) of this section in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this section, for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so
made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

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

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

Upon the death of a member after retirement, an allowance, in addition to the death benefit provided in the immediately preceding paragraph, shall be paid to his surviving spouse, until such surviving spouse's death or remarriage, equal to one-half of his retirement allowance as it was prior to optional modification and prior to reduction as provided in subsection (a) of Section 8.514 of this charter, but exclusive of the part of such allowance which was provided by additional contributions. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this paragraph to a surviving spouse unless such surviving spouse was married to said member at least one year prior to his retirement. If such retired person leaves no such surviving spouse, or if such surviving spouse should die or remarry before every child of such deceased retired person attains the age of eighteen years, the allowance which such surviving spouse would have received had he or she lived and not remarried shall be paid to retired person's child or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

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

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 twelve 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 F. Force shall be for one-year twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve 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 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four 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 thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated in his 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 his the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which he that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotive classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall 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.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments.

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolmen patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its
duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in Section 3.531 of this Charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or policemen patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in Section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month now provided in $subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean “compensation earnable” as used in Section 8.549.

The term “police officers or policemen patrol officers” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by Section 8.361 of this Charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he such sergeant shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in $subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firemen firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall
be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter. For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firemen" "firefighters" as used in this section means the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective rate of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, policemen, patrol officers or firemen; firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uni-
formed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975–76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT VOTING

You can vote for any candidate, regardless of party. This is a General Election and you can vote for any candidate on your ballot. Political party restrictions only apply at Primary Elections (in June).

Do not vote for more than the authorized number of candidates or none of your votes for that contest will be counted. Most candidate contests specify "Vote for one" but you can vote for up to six supervisors and up to four School and College Board members. If you make a mistake and vote for more than six candidates for supervisor you can get a replacement ballot.

If you move, you must re-register. The most common complaint we get on election day is that someone can't vote because they have moved and not re-registered. If you have moved, your name will probably not be on the rolls anymore and even if it is, it is not legal to vote using your old polling place (except in certain rare circumstances). Next time you move, don't leave your vote behind; remember to re-register.

You don't have to be sick or out-of-town to get an absentee ballot. Any voter can request an absentee ballot for any reason, or for no reason. To become a "permanent" absentee voter you must be disabled but ordinary absentee voters do not have to have a reason.

Your registration will not necessarily be cancelled if you don't vote but chances of that happening will increase if you don't vote. After the election, we will send a postcard confirming the address of all nonvoters. If the Post Office or the current resident says you don't live there anymore, your registration will be cancelled. No one is automatically cancelled for not voting at any election.

It is not necessary to re-register before each election. Your registration is permanent and will remain in effect until you move, die or are convicted of a felony.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

**SPECIAL NOTE:**

**IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER:**

Notas: 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 "Votomatic."

**STEP 2**

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

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabezas 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 perfora con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

**STEP 4**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ____________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________ Apt. # ______

Telephone No. (required) _____________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

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

Second choice locations (if any) ____________________________

Signature ____________________________________________
### EXTRA APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Since this page would have been blank anyway, we have used the space to reprint an extra copy of the absentee ballot application form.

Your "real" absentee ballot application appears as a postcard inserted into this book. We would prefer that you use the postcard form because it is easier to process and less likely to get lost.

If two persons in your household are requesting absentee ballots, you may put both postcard forms into an envelope in order to save postage.

The **disabled** may apply as permanent absentee voters by completing the little box at the bottom of the form. Disabilities that qualify for permanent absentee status include circulatory problems and mobility impairments as well as more severe disabilities.

If you have not yet received your absentee ballot, then you are probably not on our permanent absentee mailing list. The permanent absentee voters' ballots were mailed out the week of October 9th.
Application for absentee ballot appears on Page 48
Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊登在第48頁

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
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### President and Vice President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>for President</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td>for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>for President</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMA WONG MAR</td>
<td>for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. MONDALE</td>
<td>for President</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALDINE A. FERRARO</td>
<td>for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BERGLAND</td>
<td>for President</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES A. LEWIS</td>
<td>for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB RICHARDS</td>
<td>for President</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN KENNEDY SALAMAN</td>
<td>for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### United States Representative 5th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress, 5th District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Accountant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENADOR ESTATAL</th>
<th>MILTON MARKS, Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>State Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador Estatic</td>
<td>州參議員</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAUL KANGAS, Peace &amp; Freedom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizador Socialista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>社會主義組織者</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIA BELLi, Democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade Negotiator/Conservationist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negociador de Comercio/Abogado Por La Conservación</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK PICKENS, Libertarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propietario de Pequenos Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小商業主</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</th>
<th>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR., Democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td>Speaker, California Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th District</td>
<td>Orador, Asamblea de California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEE S. DOLSON, Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maestro de Universidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大學教師</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Member, Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Title</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Community Service Attorney / Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Administrator / Administrador de Servicios de Salud</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT D. INGRAHAM</td>
<td>Political Consultant / Consultor Político</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR M. DAVIS</td>
<td>Hi-Tech Business Woman / Mujer de Negocios / Campo Tecnológico</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td>Management Consultant / Consultor Administrativo</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE B. KENNEDY</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors / Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician / Músico</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP</td>
<td>Attorney / Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogado / Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SALEH ABDULLA</td>
<td>Real Estate Salesman / Vendedor de Bienes y Raíces</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUZANNE ALBERTO</td>
<td>Administrative Secretary / Secretaria Administrativa</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE RENNE</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors / Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Political Scientist / Educator / Especialista en Ciencias Políticas / Educador</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIANNE MALVEAUX</td>
<td>Economics Professor / Writer / Profesor de Economía / Escritor</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN L. MOLINARI</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors / Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPORTANT:**
There are two (2) pages of candidates for Supervisor. (29 candidates, vote for 6)

---

**NOTE:**
29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.

(Contest Continued on Next Page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES</td>
<td>Banker Banquero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS</td>
<td>Executor Ejecutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant Militante Sindical Socialista 社会主義聯盟鬥士</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>RUBY T. JIMENEZ</td>
<td>Directory Sales Representative Representante de Ventas de Directorios 姓名地址錄推銷員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY ANDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>SFCC Student Estudiante de SFCC 市立大學學生</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>HARRY BRITT</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市参議員 (續下)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant Militante Sindical Socialista 社会主義聯盟鬥士</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>RANDALL BRONNER</td>
<td>Artist, Musician Artista / Músico 藝術家，音樂家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>JONATHAN BULKLEY</td>
<td>Architect / Neighborhood Planner Arquitecto / Planificador 建築師／街坊設計師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>ROGER BOSCHETTI</td>
<td>T.V. Ethnic Producer Productor de Programas Etnicos de Televisión 電視少數民族製作人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>KEVIN STARR</td>
<td>Businessman, Communicator, Professor Hombre de Negocios, Comunicador, Profesor 商人，信息員，教授</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>CAROL RUTH SILVER</td>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo 現任市参議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>DAVID C. SMITH</td>
<td>Administrator, Service Agency Escritor, Movimiento Socialista 服務機構行政管理員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>JOHN E. WAHL</td>
<td>Attorney Abogado 律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Writer, Socialist Action Escritor, Movimiento Socialista 作家，社會主義活動家</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE**

29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>Parent and Teacher, Maestra y Madre de Familia</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant, Contador Público / Consultor Financiero</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>Consultant, Consultor</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE S. HOPP</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICK CERBATOS</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education, Miembro, Junta de Educacion</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON</td>
<td>Supervisor, Muni Railway, Supervisor, Tranvías Municipales</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBBY DENEBEIM</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE DYKSTRA</td>
<td>Community Services Director, Director de Servicios Comunitarios</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>Motor Truck Operator, Conductor de Camiones</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
МИЕНБРО, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMUNIDAD, Member, Community College Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>En el Cargo</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST &quot;CHUCK&quot; AYALA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN GOODMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE F. PEHARGOU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOS C. BROWN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM WOLFRED</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MIEMBRO, JUNTA DIRECTIVA, DISTRITO BART 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>En el Cargo</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARON A. VIEIRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RODNEY JOHNSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN H. KIRKWOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, GENERAL ELECTION, NOVEMBER 6, 1984

#### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>CLEAN WATER BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $325,000,000 to provide funds for water pollution control, water conservation, and water reclamation projects and activities.</td>
<td>YES 184</td>
<td>NO 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td>STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>YES 187</td>
<td>NO 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td>HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE CLEANUP BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for hazardous substance cleanup.</td>
<td>YES 190</td>
<td>NO 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td>CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $75,000,000 to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>YES 193</td>
<td>NO 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $650,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>YES 196</td>
<td>NO 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td>SENIOR CENTER BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $50,000,000 to provide funds for senior centers.</td>
<td>YES 199</td>
<td>NO 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION, FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS EXCLUSION. Empowers Legislature to exclude from property tax reassessment certain newly constructed fire protection improvements. Fiscal Impact: If implemented, estimated local government property tax revenue losses of less than $5 million annually, state government increases in costs to compensate for local school district property tax loss, and state government increases in income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>YES 203</td>
<td>NO 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td>SUPREME COURT. TRANSFER OF CAUSES. REVIEW OF DECISIONS. Modifies existing constitutional provisions regarding transfer of causes and review of decisions. Fiscal Impact: No significant effect.</td>
<td>YES 206</td>
<td>NO 207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DONDE LOS VOTANTES PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA LIMPIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $325,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para control de la contaminación del agua, conservación del agua y para proyectos y actividades de recuperación del agua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar el desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA LIMPIEZA DE SUBSTANCIAS PELIGROSAS. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para limpiar el medio las substancias peligrosas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA POTABLE SALUBRE DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $75,000,000 para proporcionar la mejora de los sistemas de agua domésticos para cumplir con las normas mínimas de agua potable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $650,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA CENTROS PARA PERSONAS DE EDAD MAYOR DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $50,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para centros para personas de edad mayor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE LOS SISTEMAS DE PROTECCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS. Otraña poder a la Legislatura para excluir del recaudado del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas mejoras recientemente construidas para protección contra incendios. Impacto fiscal: De ser llevada a cabo, pone dem en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad para los gobiernos locales calculadas en menos de $5 millones anuales, además aumentos en los impuestos del gobierno estatal para compensar a los distritos escolares Locales por la pérdida en impuestos a la propiedad, y aumentos para el gobierno estatal en los ingresos provenientes del impuesto a la renta debido a menores deducciones en los impuestos a la propiedad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>CORTE SUPREMA. TRANSFERENCIAS DE CAUSAS. REVISIÓN DE DECISIONES. Modifica las disposiciones constitucionales en vigencia en cuanto al traspaso de causas y a la revisión de decisiones. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto significativo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Property Tax Postponement. Disabled Person

**Proposition 33**

Authorizes Legislature to postpone property tax payments on owner occupied principal residence by disabled person. Fiscal Impact: State expenditures estimated to be less than $2 million annually which would be recovered, with interest, when the homes are sold.

- Yes: 210
- No: 211

### Property Taxation. Historic Structure Exclusion

**Proposition 34**

Excludes from property tax reassessment certain new construction on owner occupied principal residence historic structures. Fiscal Impact: Local governments property tax revenue loss of less than $100,000 annually. State government expenditure of about 32% of this to compensate local school districts for property tax revenue losses.

- Yes: 214
- No: 215

35

(Proposition 35 has been withdrawn from the ballot)

### Taxation

**Proposition 36**

Amends Proposition 13 adding restrictions on real property taxation, new tax measures, and charging fees. Provides specified tax refunds. Fiscal Impact: State revenues reduced at least $100 million, net, over first two-year period. State costs increased up to $750 million over first two-year period and by about $150 million annually in subsequent years to replace revenue losses to schools. Local agencies other than schools property tax and other revenue losses of about $2.8 billion, net, over first two-year period and of about $1.1 billion annually in subsequent years.

- Yes: 223
- No: 224

### State Lottery

**Proposition 37**

Establishes state-operated lottery. Revenue use: prizes, 50%; expenses, not more than 16%; public education, at least 34%. Fiscal Impact: Cannot be predicted with certainty. Estimated yield for public education would be about $500 million annually, with less the first two years. Estimated division: K-12, 80%; Community Colleges, 13%; California State University, 5%; University of California, 2%.

- Yes: 228
- No: 229

### Voting Materials. English Only

**Proposition 38**

Requires Governor urge federal officials amend law so that voting materials be printed in English only. Fiscal Impact: Insignificant.

- Yes: 232
- No: 233
POSTERGACIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. PERSONAS INHABILITADAS. Autoriza a la Legislatura a posponer los pagos del impuesto a la propiedad sobre una residencia principal ocupada por un dueño quien sea una persona inhabilitada. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales calculados en menos de $2 millones anuales los cuales serían recuperados con intereses, cuando las residencias sean vendidas.

Fijación de Impuestos a la propiedad. Exclusión de estructuras históricas. Eximen del pago de impuestos a la propiedad ciertas construcciones y trabajos nuevos en residencias que sean estructuras históricas ocupadas por sus dueños como el principal lugar de residencia. Impacto fiscal: Pérdidas para los gobiernos locales en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad de menos de $100,000 anuales. Gastos gubernamentales estatales alrededor del 3% de esta suma para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida de ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad.

La Proposición número 35 no será usada en esta elección.

Fijación de Impuestos. Enmienda la Proposición 13 añadiendo restricciones a la fijación de impuestos a la propiedad inmueble, nuevas medidas de impuestos y honorarios a cobrarse. Disipone reembolsos específicos de impuestos. Impacto fiscal: Reducción en los ingresos estatales en por lo menos $100 millones anuales, durante el primer periodo de dos años. Aumento en los costos de funcionamiento de hasta $750 millones anuales durante el primer periodo de dos años y en unos $150 millones anuales en años subsecuentes para reemplazar la pérdida de ingresos para escuelas. Pérdidas para otras agencias locales, además de para las escuelas, del impuesto a la propiedad y todas las pérdidas de ingresos de alrededor de $2.8 mil millones netos, durante el primer periodo de dos años y de alrededor de $1.1 mil millones anualmente en años subsecuentes.

LOTERÍA ESTATAL. Establece una lotería operada por el estado. Uso de los ingresos: premios, el 50%; gastos, no más del 16%; educación pública, por lo menos el 54%. Impacto fiscal: No puede ser predicho con certeza. El rendimiento que se calcula para la educación pública, será de alrededor de $2000 millones anuales, siendo menor los dos primeros años. División que se calcula: jardín de niños al 12avo grado, el 80% y 60% para la comunidad, el 13%. Universidad Estatal de California, el 9%. Universidad de California, el 2%.

MATERIALES DE VOTACIÓN. INGLÉS SOLAMENTE. Requiere que el Gobernador ubique a los oficiales federales que emienden la ley para que los materiales para votación sean impresos en inglés solamente. Impacto fiscal: Insignificante.
### REAPPORTIONMENT

Provides reapportioning Senate, Assembly, Congressional, Equalization districts for 1986 and subsequent elections by new commission composed of former justices. Fiscal Impact: Commission costs of up to $3.5 million before 1986 election. Costs of $10,000 to $20,000 each to relocate an unknown number of district legislative offices. County costs of about $500,000 for 1986 election materials. County savings of about $300,000 in 1986 for printing costs, and $200,000 every two years thereafter. Future reapportionments will probably cost less than under existing law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>39</strong></th>
<th><strong>REAPPORTIONMENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>237 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>238 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Limits contributors and contributions to elective state office candidates. Opposition candidate’s personal expenditures matched by limited public funding. Fiscal Impact: Reduce state revenues by about $100,000 each fiscal year and increase state expenditures by approximately up to $1,650,000 each fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>40</strong></th>
<th><strong>CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>242 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>243 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUBLIC AID, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Creates Public Assistance Commission. Limits benefit expenditures to national average plus 10%. Legislative amendments permitted. Fiscal Impact: Net effect would be combined state and county expenditure reduction beginning July 1, 1986. Size of reduction and impact at different levels of government impossible to determine. Substantial reductions under specified programs would be partially offset to an unknown extent by increased costs under other programs and reduced tax revenues resulting from reduced federal expenditures within the state. Likely, state expenditures would be reduced and county expenditures increased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>41</strong></th>
<th><strong>PUBLIC AID, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>247 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>248 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

#### A

Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A</strong></th>
<th><strong>Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>253 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>254 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>B</strong></th>
<th><strong>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>256 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>257 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C

Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>C</strong></th>
<th><strong>Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>259 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>260 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REDISTRIBUCIÓN. Dispone redistribución para los distritos del Senado, Asamblea, Congreso y de la Junta de Revisión de Avalúos para 1986 y para las elecciones subsiguientes mediante nueva comisión compuesta de anteriores jueces. Impacto fiscal: Costos de la comisión de hasta $3,5 millones antes de la elección de 1986. Costos de $10,000 a $20,000 cada uno para reubicar un número desconocido de oficinas legales en los distritos. Costos del condado alrededor de $500,000 para materiales para la elección de 1986. Ahorro para el condado alrededor de $300,000 en 1986 por cuentos de impresión y $300,000 cada dos años de allí en adelante. Las redistribuciones futuras probablemente costarán menos que bajo la ley actual.

CONTRIBUCIONES PARA COMPANÍAS. Limita a los contribuyentes y las contribuciones a candidatos a cargos políticos electivos. Iguala con fondos públicos limitados los gastos personales del candidato de oposición. Impacto fiscal: Reduce los ingresos estatales en unos $100,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal y aumenta los gastos estatales en aproximadamente $1,650,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal.

AYUDA PÚBLICA, PROGRAMAS DE ASISTENCIA MÉDICA. Crea Comisión de Asistencia Pública. Limita gastos de beneficio al promedio nacional más el 10%. Permite enmiendas legislativas. Impacto fiscal: el efecto neto sería la reducción de los gastos combinados del estado y condados comenzando el 1 de julio de 1986. El tamaño de la reducción y su impacto en los diferentes niveles del gasto es imposible determinar en este momento. Reducciones sustanciales bajo programas específicos serían parcialmente compensadas hasta un grado desconocido mediante el aumento de gastos bajo otros programas y por ingresos de impuestos reducidos que resulten de gastos federales reducidos dentro del estado. Es factible que los gastos estatales serían reducidos y que los gastos de condados aumentarían.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

A. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión del Puente a emitir $42,500,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la construcción y mejoras de las instalaciones portuarias?

B. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir $104,000,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones para el Departamento de Aguas?

C. ¿Deberá crearse una Comisión de Salud que consista de siete miembros nombrados por el Alcalde para dirigir y controlar los hospitales de la Ciudad y el Condado, y los demás servicios de salud del Condado, y para nombrar un Director de Salud Pública?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?</th>
<th>YES 261 →</th>
<th>NO 262 →</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?</td>
<td>YES 264 →</td>
<td>NO 265 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?</td>
<td>YES 267 →</td>
<td>NO 268 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?</td>
<td>YES 270 →</td>
<td>NO 271 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?</td>
<td>YES 274 →</td>
<td>NO 275 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?</td>
<td>YES 278 →</td>
<td>NO 279 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and Black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?</td>
<td>YES 283 →</td>
<td>NO 284 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Código</td>
<td>Votación</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
<td>Resumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Jubilaciones a hacer inversiones de los fondos de jubilación como persona prudente en lugar de hacer inversiones de carácter legal para compañías de seguros?</td>
<td>應否授權退休委員會作退休基金投資時，可用個人判斷謹慎行事，而不必限於作法律容許保險公司所作的投資?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Ciudad subvencionar al coayugo sobreviviente de empleados activos o retirados de la misma manera que la Ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o retirados en el Sistema de Servicios de la Salud?</td>
<td>市政府為給職身故或退休後去世的僱員的遺偶的保健康利金，應否與給職或退休僱員的津貼相同?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagar un beneficio de doce meses de salario por fallecimiento a diversos oficiales y empleados que mueren como resultado de lesiones físicas externas y violentas durante el transcurso y periodo de empleo?</td>
<td>在工作中或在工作範圍內身體遭受暴力引致的外傷而殉職的各類官員和僱員，應否付給十二個月薪餃的死亡撫恤金?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá el período probatorio para oficiales de policía extenderse de un año a partir de su entrada a un año después de haber completado el entrenamiento pero sin exceder ochenta y cuatro semanas?</td>
<td>應否延長警員的試用期，即從加入警局起一年延至完成訓練後一年的時間，但不能超過八十四個星期?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagar un salario adicional a los miembros del Departamento de Policía asignados a prestar servicio en todas las motocicletas de dos ruedas?</td>
<td>應否給予警局駕駛兩輪摩托車的警員額外報酬，其數額根據加州有350,000人口的城市此種報酬的平均數而定?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>(Ordenanza de Iniciativa): Deberá San Francisco solicitar al Gobierno Federal que pregunte a los contribuyentes de impuestos si desean que una parte de sus impuestos se use para un excesivo gasto militar y si desean que la Ciudad publique un informe anual sobre los impuestos federales recaudados en San Francisco y sobre la parte usada para propósitos militares excesivos y la parte usada para necesidades sociales?</td>
<td>(創制法令): 舊金山應否要求聯邦政府徵求所有納稅人的意見是否願意讓他們的稅款用在過度的軍事費用上，並由市政府每年刊印一份報告，詳列有關聯邦在舊金山所徵稅款，以及用於過度軍事目的和用於社會需要的部分?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>(Declaración de Norma): ¿Deberá ser la norma de San Francisco que ningún fondo de pensión administrado por la Ciudad sea invertido en empresas que tienen intereses comerciales en Sudáfrica hasta que sea abolida la segregación racial y se otorgue a la población de raza negra plenos derechos políticos y civiles en Sudáfrica?</td>
<td>(政策聲明): 舊金山應否制訂政策，規定市政府管理的退休基金不能投資在與南非有商業關係的商號，直至南非廢除種族隔離，給予黑人充分的政治權利和民權為止?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

A 第一步
请双手将选票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 1

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coincidan con los dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之 二孔，即合於二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
请把带针之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 9, 1984.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election, such as this one, you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot.

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

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature, Supervisors, B.A.R.T., College Governing Board and Board of Education.

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

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

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 6, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 6, 1984.
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

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

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

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 25 through 41 because in June the numbers were 16 through 24.

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

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

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

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

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

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
RODNEY JOHNSON

My age is 35
My occupation is a lawyer
My education and qualifications are: I am an attorney for Stanford University. Each day I help make decisions on financial matters, lawsuits, personnel issues, and policy for Stanford, which has an operating budget greater than $500 million. This involves matters ranging from running a hospital, to building 1000 units of new housing for faculty and staff. Additionally, I studied transportation while in college.

The BART representative should work for transportation solutions for San Francisco, and not just for BART. Can you find a seat on the bus? A parking place? I not only will work to manage BART more efficiently but also for San Francisco to obtain its fair share of money and consideration from federal, state, and local agencies in solving these problems.

I know the responsibilities of a public official. Elected to the 1978 Charter Commission, I served as its secretary and was appointed by Governor Brown to the regional Coastal Commission. I have worked to improve my neighborhood as a member of the Board of Directors of the Richmond District Neighborhood Center and the S.F. Local Development Corporation.

My endorsers include Assemblyman Art Agnos, former Police Chief Tom Cahill, Supervisors Britt, Silver, and Walker, and former Supervisors Lau and Morrison.

Rodney Johnson

JOHN H. KIRKWOOD

My age is 37
My occupation is BART Director/Incumbent
My education and qualifications are: 13 years experience in transit. Graduate: Lick-Wilmerding, Stanford University. Since my 1974 election to the BART Board, I have consistently pushed BART to improve and function more efficiently. BART has doubled the number of cars in service; increased access for handicapped people and bicyclists; increased on-time performance from 45% to 95%; stopped fare evasion; increased opportunities for minorities and women; kept per-mile costs down; given employees more flexible schedules; and drastically improved fire and safety procedures (BART has run 5 billion passenger miles without a single passenger fatality, the best record in the nation.)

I constantly review transit professional journals and the trade press. I spend countless hours analyzing budgets and operating plans to find errors and false assumptions. My ambition is to be the best possible BART Director, not to seek higher office. If you have questions, call me at 362-2939.

My supporters include:
Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
John Molinari, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
Agnes I. Chan, Former Charter Commissioner
Nancy Lenvin, President, Public Utilities Commission
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transportation Commissioner
Eugene Garfinkle, BART Director
Margaret Pryor, BART Director
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker, California Assembly

John H. Kirkwood

ARON VIEIRA

My age is 21
My occupation is Computer Technician
My education and qualifications are: As a founding member of The Community for Human Development in San Francisco, I am running for this office out of my deep concern for the Board's undemocratic policies and suspicious behavior. Although all of us in District 9 pay for BART few of us are informed about the decisions and operations of the BART Board.

Meetings are not widely publicized. When was the last time you were informed about a BART meeting? In fact the BART Board exercises a monopoly over BART decision making by closing its doors to active citizen participation.

If elected, my first priority will be to Open Up the BART Board meetings to public scrutiny. All meetings will be held at times and places convenient to San Francisco voters.

Public Transportation should be by and for the people! Humanize the BART!!

Aron Vieira

---
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JOHN SALEH ABDULLA
My address is 2533 Folsom Street
My occupation is Licensed Real Estate Salesman
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: I graduated at a local public high school. I also attended private business schools. I am presently a licensed real estate salesman. Knowing the city's acute housing and employment problems, I am deeply concerned of the these problems and would like to be in a position to find solutions to these problems. While I have no immediate solutions; if elected, I promise the people of San Francisco that I will devote all of my time to finding solutions to these problems by utilizing all resources available to public officials in solving these problems.

John Saleh Abdulla

The sponsors for John Saleh Abdulla are:
Saleh M. Abdulla, 155 Clipper St., Janitor
Sam Buchanan, 288 Eddy St., Janitor
Richard F. Bourdon, 165 Clipper St., Mover
Peter Bury, 555 Post St., Musician
Freddie Cononica, 1419 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Alfred Catalin, 1459 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Bernard Fabano, 3609-18th St., Deputy Clerk
Robert Fulgham, 487 Joost St., Business Representative
Saleh M. Ghanem, 155 Clipper St., Maintenance
Stephen A. Halbe, 1202-23rd Ave., Musician
Jamal Jawad, 488 Ellis St., Business Owner
Zelma Ann Johnston, 575 O'Farrell St., Retired
Barbara D. Jones, 1421 South Van Ness Ave., Housewife
Alfred E. Kelly, 610 Polk St., Retired Union Official
Yhya S. Mohamed, 640 Eddy St., Maintenance
Brian Charles Percy, 333 Hyde St., Payroll clerk
Charles Ridgell, 347 Lexington St., Business Representative, Juntiors Union
James Roy Sellers, 575 O'Farrell St., Unemployed
Madeline Smith, 159 Clipper St., Housewife
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect

SUZANNE ALBERTO
My address is 25 Pinto Avenue
My occupation is Administrative Secretary
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I am a Hispanic-Filipina (English/Spanish-speaking) administrative-secretarial San Francisco worker and Muni commuter and have been a resident voter since 1968.

I believe San Franciscans would be better served if suitable inquiry and evaluation preceded passage of locally needed and desired legislation and tax revenue expenditures to assure anticipated results. San Francisco's Charter permits supervisory inquiry into expenditures. I strongly support thoroughly researched legislation and tax revenue use to benefit the peoples of San Francisco.

All of my sponsors know me to be a capable, persistent fighter for principles and public benefit and believe I would be an excellent supervisor.

Suzanne Alberto

The sponsors for Suzanne Alberto are:
L. J. Alberto, 4156-25th St., Communication Technician
Alvin E. Bernstein, 6 Roanoke St., Computer Analyst
David Carlton Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Tape Librarian
Sarah M. Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Programer/analyst
Rose Violet Desello, 215 Niagara Ave., Retired Bookkeeper
Deidra D. Dunlap, 125 DeMontfort Ave., Telecom Specialist
R. L. Feather, 111 Inverness St., Secretary
Angel Fernandez, Jr., 1419-11th Ave., Security Officer
David L. Forks, 26 Shields St., Janitor
Paul F. Farn, 235-44th Ave., Security Guard
Joyce A. Glynn, 38 Serrano Dr., Legal Secretary
Margery M. Gray-Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Financial Administrator
Amy J. Koecher, 2006 Fell St., Office Manager
Cheryl Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Housewife
Cheryenne Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Welder
David Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Truck Driver
Ruth Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Housewife
Ardis McCana, 1789 McAllister St., Custodian
Dewey W. McNeil, 251 Topeka Ave., Utility Engineer
Leon Medina, 1725 Church St., Retired-Laborer
Nathan Nemer, 125 Cambron Dr., Retired-Produce Buyer
Patricia J. Powell, 2006 Fell St., Publishing
Petty Randall, 366 Wilde St., Grocery Clerk
Roberto Sampora, 328 Staples Ave., Sr. Drafter
Clifford C. Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Mechanic
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Clerical
E. L. Thomason, 111 Inverness St., Student
Kenneth E. Tucker, Jr., 243 Hahn St., Building and Grounds Patrolman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROGER BOSCHETTI

My address is 20 Carnelian Way
My occupation is Television Producer, Host, Writer, and Labor Consultant
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of involvement with working men, women, and young people, and as a concerned citizen, I will work to implement laws which will benefit all the people of San Francisco, such as reducing payroll and business tax, so as to encourage small businesses to come or stay in San Francisco, thereby creating more jobs. Will implement constructive changes in muni for speedier, safer and effective service, I will also create better programs to help the needs of our young men and women, I would like more police foot patrol, and more affordable housing, with more concern for our senior citizen.

Roger Boschetti

The sponsors for Roger Boschetti are:
William A. Arietta, 16 Wheat St., Police Officer
Rita M. Belli, 1958 Greenview St., Assessment Clerk
Rachel Boschetti, 20 Carnell St., Cosmetologist
George Contessi-Turner, 631 O’Farrell St., Instructor/Professor
Bernard M. Croisy, 2971-23rd Ave., City Employee
John E. Downey, 83 Gaviota Way, Nationally Known Referee/
Limo Driver/Boxing Judge
Curtis Elliott, 350 Glenview Dr., Doorman
Evelyn C. Fitzgerald, 230 Stonecrest Dr., School Administrator
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Dr., Labor Consultant
Robert Jacobs, 1438-88th Ave., Business Agent
Roger Michelli, 2655 Chestnut St., Goldengate Disposal
Robert T. Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Lieutenant S.F.P.D. Retired
Shirley Robin Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Investigator
Marie G. Neilsen, 319 Maynard St., Businesswoman
Marie Ann Perri, 80 Malta St., Corporate Secretary
Joseph J. Phillips, 1203 Clayton St., Attorney
John E. Ricci, 1204 Broadway, Lawyer
Don L. Rotan, 134 Gilbert St., Writer
Samuel Smith, 297 Allison St., Seaman Cook
Carmen Solis, 39 Majestic Ave., Restaurant Owner
Rose M. Tarantino, 160 Country Club Dr., Housewife
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
John J. Vidal, Sr., 1437 Judah St., Office Manager
Winston Wong, 225 Anzavista Ave., Manager of American Cab Co.
Herman W. Young, 210 Brookdale Ave., Seaman
Maya Dhillon-Zygaj, 455 Chenery St., Homemaker

RICHARD BRADLEY

My address is 1 Arthad Court
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As a supporter of the Spartacist League I twice tore down the Confederate flag of slavery which flies no more in Civic Center. The American Civil War did not complete its historic mission. It will take a third American revolution, a socialist revolution, to liberate black people. Spike Reagan’s anti-Soviet war plans and union-busting austerity drive by mass strike action! U.S. imperialism—hands off Central America! Smash Klan/Nazi terror through labor/black action! Break with Democrats—enemies of labor/minorities! Build a workers party that will stop at nothing short of socialist revolution and a workers government!

Richard Bradley

The sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikegumi, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Tedd Nolun, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 769 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennisy Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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HARRY BRITT

My address is 783A Guerrero Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: As a full-time Supervisor, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making city government respond to our needs.
• I've supported crime-reducing neighborhood patrols to protect seniors;
• fought to repeal the sewer service charge;
• worked to protect the quality of our neighborhoods and environment;
• secured funding for anti-gay violence programs, AIDS prevention, community arts programs;
• sponsored protections for renters and small businesses from skyrocketing rents;
• worked to create affordable housing;
• sponsored equal pay for comparable jobs;
• worked to have downtown pay its share of taxes;
• worked to save jobs when companies moved from San Francisco.

Harry G. Britt

The sponsors for Harry G. Britt are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister, Community College Board Member
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Member, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator
Yoji Wada, 565-4th Ave., Regent-University of California
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner,
Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28ith St., President, Harvey Milk Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., President, Alice B. Toklas Club
Wayne Friday, 1095-14th St., Newspaper Political Editor
Tom Murray, 4715 Balboa St., Newspaper Editor
Thomas F. Waddell, M.D. 141 Albion St., Athletic Games Organizer
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Affordable Housing/Tenant's Rights Worker
Edward L. Peet, 350 Arballo Dr., Senior Citizen's Advocate
John Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Sierra Club
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus
Leon Bruscher, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Howard Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Andrew Jeppson, 1334 Masonic Ave., Nuclear Freeze Leader
Philip E. De Andrada, 601 Mississippi St., Small Business Owner
Georgianna Lynn, 165 El Verano St., West Portal Avenue
Business Owner
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon St., Registered Nurse

RANDALL DWAYNE BRONNER

My address is 1390 Market Street
My occupation is artist-musician
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: San Francisco Budget Surplus-$162 Million.
Muni Fare/Fast Pass Revenue-$46 Million.
Aspen, Colorado-Free buses ten years.
Portland-Free buses downtown.
We residents pay for more than two thirds of Muni's cost in our taxes. Residents should ride Muni for free!
You must check out the murals supporting Peace in Central America on Balmy Street.
Please call 864-8641 if you'd like to meet the survivors of 1906, free, at the Great Earthquake Exposition.
If you want to brighten up your street call San Francisco Street Gardeners for free cuttings, succulents; and flowers, at the same number.

Randall Bronner

The sponsors for Randall Bronner are:
Selig R. Raphael, 495-33rd Ave., Survivor 1906 Quake
June Dornacker, 9 Central Ave., Reporter
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
William T. Witter, 948 Haight St., Artist
James T. Lyon, 1761 Page St., Musician
F. Kelly Hartin, 119 Margaret Ave., Cateress
Julie Tancil, 1653 Washington St., Waitress
Raymundo E. Pena, 1470 Fulton St., Waiter
Mary L. Martinez, 295 Moscow St., Secretary
Sandra Renzi, 861 Post St., Waitress and Prep Work
Giorgio Irving, 1390 Market St., Waiter
Martin James, 1139 Broadway, Bartender
Elizabeth Kelly, 3249 Pierce St., Restaurant Services
Anthony R., Pizzalillo, 312 Precita Ave., Artist
Carlos Gonzalez, 3409-20th St., Community Worker
Robert Burnside, 2548 Folsom St., Carpenter
Susan Cervantes, 398 Precita St., Artist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
James A. Lewis, 3030 Cabrillo St., Artist/Teacher
Julliane Malveaux, 26 Winfield St., Economist
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JONATHAN BULKLEY
My address is 147 Tenth Avenue
My occupation is Architect, Neighborhood Planner
My age is 54
My qualifications for office are: Experienced Architect and Planner. President, Planning Association for the Richmond; Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. Member: Open Space Committee, Mayor’s Task Forces for Parking, Mechanical Amusement Devices and Sidewalk Displays.

My Architecture/Planning background will help me respond to the need for a coherent vision of San Francisco as a City that works for everyone.

My priorities include:
- Housing for those most in need—singles, working women, seniors.
- Crime-free streets
- Civil service preference for San Francisco residents.
- Caring solutions to seniors’ needs.
- Eliminating Bay pollution.
- Maintaining Neighborhood Character, Diversity, and Liveability.

The interests of San Francisco Residents will always come first!

Jonathan Bulkley

The sponsors for Jonathan Bulkley are:
Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Tenant Representative, Rent Stabilization Board
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., S.F. Housing Commissioner
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Ter., Former City Planning Commissioner
Lee Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor; Former Supervisor
Jose Luis Fernandini, 464-43rd Ave., Businessman; Vice President, MAPA
Russell B. Flynn, 2610 Filbert St., President, Rent Stabilization Board
Ann Fogelberg, 2980 Vallejo St., Housewife; Vice Pres., Cow Hollow Association
Terry Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney; Former Supervisor
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Public Utilities Commissioner
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer
Ruth Gravani, 74 Mizzuh St., Glen Park Association
Anne W. Halsted, 1368 Montgomery St., Port Commissioner; Past President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
John Hooper, 201 Buena Vista East, Conservationist; President, Buena Vista Neighborhood Ass’n
Don Horanzy, 84 Kellogg Ave., Former Supervisor
John H. Kirkwood, 1635 Green St., Member, BART Board
Bill Kuhns, 4215-26th St., Co-Chair, Open Space Committee
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner
Richard Livingston, 380 Eddy St., Administrator, Realty House West; Member, Open Space Committee
Peter McCrean, 1024 Lake St., Businessman; Past Pres., Public Utilities Comm.
Amy Meyer, 3627 Clement St., Rec. & Park Commissioner
William F. O’Keeffe, Sr., 44 Corbett Ave., President, S.F.
Taxpayers Association
Thomas R. Peretti, 379-16th St., Banker; President, C.R.I.R.
Alan Raznick, 237 Topaz Way, Attorney; President, Coalition for S.F. Neighborhoods
Toby Rosenblatt, 3409 Pacific Ave., Businessman; Pres., City Planning Commission
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
Sam Valentin, 500 College Ave., Retired; Past President St. Mary’s Park Improvement Club

DIANA COLEMAN
My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I am a supporter of the Spartacists, the labor/socialists who put a stop to flying the Confederate flag, banner of KKK racism and slavery, in Civic Center. Finish the Civil War! Forward to a workers government!

Without socialist revolution catastrophe threatens mankind. We need an integrated workers party that will take the productive wealth from the capitalist bosses, and establish a workers government and socialist planned economy.

-Spike Reagan reaction through mass strikes! Military victory to Salvadoran leftists! Defend the USSR! No support to Democrats—liberal party of imperialism! Smash Taft-Hartley! Labor’s gotta play hardball to win!

Diana Coleman

The sponsors for Diana Coleman are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Richard Bradley, 1 Ardath Ct., Maintenance Building
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikegami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 5116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-24th St., Postal Worker
Dennyse Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ELEANOR M. DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Accounting Services
My qualifications for office are: My experience with community groups and City Hall is extensive.
Involved in local politics through neighborhood and merchant associations, worked on campaigns for Diane Feinstein, and many others. Served the community through the following organizations: Vice President, Clement Merchants, head of legislative committee; Consultant to Polk Merchants; Member, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Roundtable, Vice Chair Health Committee; Board, California Alcohol Treatment Services; Chairperson Alcohol Awareness; Appointee, Mayor's Task Force on Sidewalk Vending, Parking; San Francisco Outlook, Project Manager; Member, SPUR; Boardmember Public Research Institute, SFSU.
A loyal devotee of San Francisco. I will serve honestly with an open mind and heart.

Eleanor M. Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor M. Davis are:

Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
Robert R. Bacci, 2478-23rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Rachael Byleat, 2232 Hyde St., Investor
Luis A. Belmonte, 250 Walnut St., Real Estate Developer
Mildred Burrell, 2970 Pine St., General Contractor
Leslie A. Burton, 1528 Baker St., Attorney
Rose Cassano, 853 Carolina St., Artist
Toni Delacorte, 2025 Hayes St., Public Relations Executive
Catherine J Dodd, 61 Deming St., Registered Nurse
John Richard Doyle, 109-12th Ave, Attorney at Law
Adrien Belli Falk, 1000 Green St., Housewife
Rory A. Flood, 1070 Revere St., Owner, Fine Furniture Company
Patricia Hooper, 585 Arkansas St., Writer
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman and Library Commissioner
Paul Raynor Kesting, 180-4th Ave., Attorney at Law
Dennis E. Kirtley, 344 Larkin St., Manager of Gift Shop
Beatrice Kushner, 35 Presidio Ter., Attorney at Law
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Ted R. Moulton, 17 Leroy Pl., Architect
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Owner, Data Processing Company
Kenneth E. Rowell, 1319-5th Ave., Engineer
John Patrick Short, 1050 Green St., Liquor Store Owner and Chairman of Parking Authority
Robert L. Strauss, 1734-9th Ave., Graduate Student
Debbie Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner
Larry Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner

EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES

My address is 695 John Muir Drive
My occupation is Banker
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Forty-four years after my grandparents were married here in San Francisco just seven months after the nineteen hundred and six earthquake. A beautiful blond hair, blue faced baby boy came bouncing out of St. Joseph's Hospital. Studying economics at St. Mary's College after attending Riordan and then leaving religious life to create a conservation newspaper. Trying to educate local residents about the serious problems that we faced here in San Francisco and the bay area. If allowed to fulfill my dreams of what we can accomplish I will gladly give twenty-five per cent of my salary to charity.

Edward Michael Hayes

The sponsors for Edward Michael Hayes are:

Edwin B. Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Miriam Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Agnes Cassidy, 385 Day St., Retired
Anna M. d'Ottille, 1356 Dolores St., Housewife
Bertham J. d'Ottille, 1356 Dolores St., Retired
Mary M. Driscoll, 342-28th St., Administrative Assistant
John L. Flynn, 54 Seaview Terr., Banker
Elaine M. Gillaran, 133 Randall St., Banker
Rae Grubstick, 2479-40th Av., Banker
Marcia Koeel, 44 Mallorca Way, Bank Clerk
Berniece Langley, 460 Duncan St., Retired
Bernadine K. Louie, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William G. Louie, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William D MacGiffrey, 2720-35th Ave., Banker
Michael J McCarthy, 3744-22nd St., Retired
Nora S. McManus, 456 Duncan St., Retired
Ellen McSweeney, 457 Duncan St., Retired
Aileen P. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Mary C. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Leona P. Parker, 36 Harper St., Housewife
James L. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Clerk
Janet M. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Secretary
Rita M. Phillips, 230 Prospect Av, Retired
Eugene F. Sullivan, 456 Duncan St., Ironworker
Catherine C. Tassone, 1795 Sanchez St., Clerk
Nellie Tomney, 1325 Church St., Home-maker
Seymour Whitehall, 3150 Clay St., Investment Broker
Ann M. Willis, 1365 Dolores St., Housewife
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ROBERT DANIEL INGRAHAM
My address is 1637 Noriega Street
My occupation is Political Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Over one hundred years ago two great men, David Broderick and Edward Baker, gave their lives to save this Republic.
I ask you voters to compare these two San Franciscans with the small minded politicians of today.
Pathetic Wendy Nelder says "Fluoride causes AIDS"; degraded Willie Brown corrupts us with "Oh What a Night" bacchalia; Feinstein lusts for higher office, and the rest are worse.
San Francisco can play an historic role in the development of the Pacific Basin. But you, our citizens, must decide. I urge you: Join with me and other candidates of Lyndon LaRouche's NDPC in our fight.

Robert Daniel Ingraham

RUBY T. JIMENEZ
My address is 961 Delano Avenue
My occupation is Directory Sales Representative
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: A San Francisco resident since, 1948 and a naturalized American of Mexican descent, I consider myself an earnest interpreter of human needs for the Hispanic community and other minorities. Misinterpretations, injustices, lack of communication and mutual respect must be addressed and aired. These human needs for minorities and others can be solved if we end the current world depression. The humane world economic policies of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly his proposal for joint economic development between the United States and Ibero-America (Operation Juarez) can end this depression. The port of San Francisco should be expanded to become a strong world trade center.

Ruby T. Jimenez

The sponsors for Robert Ingraham are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 357 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Frajio, 1924 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnoa Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1657 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Raiston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaltis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

The sponsors for Ruby T. Jimenez are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Stanley J. Bolinski, 1909 Eddy St., Staff Clerk
Willa W. Coleman, 215 Munich St., Sales Representative
Michael Frajio, 1824 Noriega St., Student
Patricia L. Hardy, 178 Broad St., Assistant Manager
Patricia Helton, 90 Frantiss St., Teacher, Mission Community College
Andrea Konviser Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ora Lee Jones, 359 Orizaba Ave., Staff Clerk
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
Ruth Matias, 638 Sawyer St., Office Clerk
Patricia McDonagh, 385-28th St., Housewife
Thomas McDonagh, 385-28th St., Construction
Ruth E. Rosenberg, 165 Parassus Ave., Instructor
Leticia Wickershaw, 171 Precita Ave.
Lupe D. Zunadio, 274 Broad St., Sales Representative

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

ANDREW ("DADDY ANDY") JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Criminology Student
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I have been a respected citizen and server of San Francisco for 25 years. I'm involved in many community organizations that care for our community such as Glide church, Red Cross volunteers and the Singel parents resource center. I've been appointed to sit on the board of such organizations as "Mission Coalition, Mission Model Neighborhood and the Mission Education program, (appointed by Major Alioto and Mayor Moscone). I'd like to dedicate my Supervioral campaign to a few of the many people who helped me over the years, Chef Roy Hammerich, Betty Romenoff and the Mission Childcare Consortium.

Andrew Daddy Andy Jones

The sponsors for Andrew (Daddy Andy) Jones are:

Stephen Harold Irvine, 2037 15th St., Carpenter
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Joseph A. DelCarlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Chairperson of MHD
David L. Butler, 895 Shotwell St., Salesman
Diane Moananu, 45 Watchman Way, Graduate Student
David Levinson, MD, 2927 Polk St., Physician
Helen Butler, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife
Joseph A. Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Cashier
E. Perry Winston, 2666 Harrison St., Architect
Rose Sillard, 10 Lucky St., Housewife
John Maras, 20-12th St., Student
Donald Strickland, 981 Shotwell St., Musician & Carpenter
Juanita Del Carlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Hiring Hall Director
Oscar Herrera, 360 Holyoke St., Educator
Delmar T. Burge, 142 Central Ave., Professional Musician
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Jesse S. Valencio, 751 Castro St., Job Developer
Peter Anthony Rivera, 57 Peters Ave., Counselor
Fernando Cosio, 177 Johnston Dr., Executive Director
Miguel Quinonez, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Social Worker
Harry W. Madison, 4017 Polk St., Appliance Repair
Paul Sussman, 1243 Third Ave., Housing Finance
Carmencita L. De La Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Kathryn M. McCamant, 625 Scott St., Tenant Organizer
Lynne Bessom, 2135-28th Ave., Grants Coordinator
Harry E. Baker, 1345 Clement St., Project Coordinator

WILLIE B. KENNEDY

My address is 950 Duncan Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: In my three years as Supervisor, I have worked to maintain and improve the unique quality of life we have in San Francisco—from rent control to fighting for parks and open spaces. I honor our rich diversity of cultures and life styles through support of neighborhood preservation and the rights of all groups—from children to seniors.

I initiated a campaign to control the tragic increase in child abuse; and am working hard on the problem of decreased employment, particularly for youth.

I want to continue serving your interests in making this the most liveable city in the United States.

Willie B. Kennedy

The sponsors for Willie B. Kennedy are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Elected Official, Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 9 Sloot Blvd., Member of Congress
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor/Airport Commissioner
Al Bovice, 234 Gates St., Attorney At Law
Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Agrippino R. Cerbates, 471 Hoffman St., Member, Board of Education
Handy Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant, Commissioner PUC
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
James C. Hornel, 19 Miguell St., Consultant
LeRoy King, 75 Zamba Ln., Union Official
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Aldo P. Lera, 1177 California St., Electrical Contractor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nob Hill St., Philanthropist
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
James McCray, Jr., 164-6th Ave., Minister
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
Adolph Schuman, 1170 Sacramento St., Businessman
Stan Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Yuri Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

My address is 121 Golden Gate Avenue
My occupation is Musician
My qualifications for office are: I am one of many in unity with San Francisco's diversity. I "Keyes" will open doors for you, to: homes, jobs, health care, better schools, provide more: complimentary fine arts, concerts, veterans benefits, senior services; close doors on pornography, drugs and prostitution; clean our streets and make them safe once more; eliminate wasteful spending and lower your taxes. For reasons like these, I am your "Keyes". Never again, will any San Franciscan go wanting, while "special interest" lick their fingers. Let us shine bright, the city that knows how, a guiding light to world peace now.

God help us.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys are:
Gary Gene Adams, 139-5th Ave., Plastic Fabricator
Wayne Austin, 391 Leavenworth St., Job Developer
Brian Chew, 334-30th Ave., Restaurant Worker
Ginger Coyote Coleman, 734 Bush St., Editor of Punk Globe
Hugh T. Dauley, 1177 California St., Computer Operator
Thomas A. Finney, 165 Turk St., Disabled/SSI
Howard M. Grayson, 160 Eddy St., Community Coordinator,
Hosp. House
Louis J. Gweder, 427 Valley St., Laborer
Mickey C. Helmel, 777 Tehama St., Patriot
John R. Hess, 554 Broadway St., Doorman
Kevin M. Kennedy, 250 McAllister St., Social Worker
Patricia E. Kerman, 1026 Montgomery St., Film Maker
John Lyman, 149-6th St., Musician
Patrick Marsh, 231-27th St., Chef
Perry V. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Teacher
Michelle Miller, 15 Surrey St., Student
David M. Moebis, 250 Frederick, Symphonic Musician
Keith F. Moog, 1233 Guerrero St., Controller
Gary Posner, 453 Broadway St., Engineer
Steven Present, 375 Ellis St., Security Officer
Clark Sullivan, 765 Ellis St., Political Activist
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Office/Clerical
Robin Vega, 1330 Jessie St., Courier
H. Joseph Wagner, 121 Golden Gate Ave., Musician
James E. Washington, Jr. 55 Mason St., Consultant, Arts and Science
Guy West, 640 Polk St., Broadcasting
Linda Marie White, 777 Tehama St., Seamstress

David L. Kilber

My address is 1901 Noriega Street
My occupation is Management Consultant
My age is 40
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of Oregon State University, a Vietnam Veteran, and a former candidate for California State Assembly. I have resided in the Sunset district with my wife Susan for five years.

I stand for a strong defense policy including the Beam Weapon anti-missile defense and the technology boom this new "Apollo" program will bring to the local economy.

San Francisco must become a center for science, classical culture, and trade, bringing blue-collar families and industry back to this city. We must expand the Port of San Francisco and launch the Pacific Basin development strategy proposed by economist Lyndon LaRouche.

David L. Kilber

The sponsors for David L. Kilber are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Polson St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 337 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Friijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elorna Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan K. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Leonzo, 576 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninecz, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
Edith Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retired
J.G. Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retailer

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

QUENTIN L. KOPP

My address is 68 Country Club Drive
My occupation is Attorney/Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Local government is us, because we depend upon it to provide essential services and wise leadership. For 13 years I've fought to cut governmental waste and excessive taxation, to keep government honest and on its toes. My efforts have already saved taxpayers over $250,000,000 and I'm proud to be the one supervisor who watches how every dollar is spent. This year City government will spend an average $4,500,000 a day, every day. I want to continue my role as your "financial watchdog" in City Hall and add a needed balance to the Board. I would very much appreciate your support.

Quentin L. Kopp

The sponsors for Quentin L. Kopp are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Former Mayor
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Former Member of the Board of Supervisors
A. Marquez Bautista, 1525 Powell St., Attorney at Law
Sala Burton, 8 Shot Blvd., Member of Congress
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Margaret Cruz, 239 Monterey Blvd., Businessperson
Robert C. Ellis, 469 Magellan Ave., Attorney at Law
George Evankovich, 1600-A Greenwich St., Labor Representative
Terry A. Francois, 20 Turava St., Attorney at Law
Jack E. Frankel, 72-22nd Ave., Rabbi
Merla Zellerbach Goerner, 225 Presidio Ter., Author/Journalist
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Attorney at Law
Carleton Goodlett, 2000 O'Farrell St., Publisher
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author/Retired Publisher
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonestreet Dr., Contractor
Golda Kaufman, 2900 Pacific Ave., Homemaker/Volunteer
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070-26th Ave., Congressional Assistant
Joseph P. Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
John Lo Schiavo, 2130 Fulton St., Priest/Educatior
Haig G. Mardikian, 2960 Divisadero St., Businessman
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 215-18th Ave., Retired President of City Employees

John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Bob Ross, 4200-30th St., Newspaper Publisher
Harriet C. Salarno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Self Employed
Buze A. Telor, 581 Orienza Ave., Educator/Police Commissioner
Dorothy Yukich, 177 San Aleso Ave., Housewife/Volunteer
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo Drive
My occupation is Political Scientist/Educator
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: impressive. A full decade of political activism at national, state, and local levels. Leadership roles in labor, housing, and education. To illustrate my seriousness in leading our City, I have launched the following initiative campaigns:
* A 3-year rent freeze
* Commercial rent control
* A balanced budget
* Expedition of labor disputes
* Driver-ownership of taxicabs
* An outdoor stadium in front of Moscone Center
As your supervisor, I will pursue:
* District elections for district councils
* Metro services for the Richmond, Marina, Bayview
* Higher police standards
* More schools and parks
You need me now, San Francisco! Who else you gonna call?

Julian O. Lagos

The sponsors for Julian Lagos are:
Charles Martin Adams, 54 4th St., Cab Driver
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 577 Arballo Dr., Psychologist
Elizabeth Alvarez, 1362 La Playa St., Sales
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall St., Computer Consultant
Elizabeth Benford, 508 Andover St., Attorney
Katherine Bobowski, 417 Stockton St., Unemployed
Thomas J. Callan, 17 Stroo Heights Blvd, Consultant
James D. Cantor, 742 Treat Ave., Station Attendant
Henry Conserva, 1258 40th Ave., Professor
Leon Datangel, 725 Van Ness Ave., Businessman
Peggy L. Dickson, 320 Montecillo, Student
Mark Emery, 505 Taylor St., Artist
James Michael Faye, 1369-B Page St., Tenant Advocate
Philomena Higgins, 146 Fillmore St., Videographer
Kcn Johnson, 42 Kelloch St., Cabdriver
Vincent B. Lutper, 4118-A 24th St., Service Manager
Richard Loewinsohn, 1341 Valencia St., Writer
John B. Lorette, 905 Columbus Ave., Cab Driver/Fisherman
Berniece Martin, 506 Church St., Public Stenographer
Jonathan Mc Cutly, 81 Alamo St., Attorney
Victor E. Miller, 1341 Valencia St., Editor
Steven A. Schectman, 1301 20th St., Attorney
William F. Taylor, 1890 Clay St., Operating Engineer
Frank S. Warner, 2530 Fillmore St., Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 249 Cotter St., Legal Worker

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

JULIANNE MALVEAUX

My address is 26 Winfield Street
My occupation is Economics Professor/Labor Specialist/Writer
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan and former White House staffer (1977-78) Dr. Julianne Malveaux (pronounced “Mal-Voh”) is an elected California State Central Committee woman who is committed to a diverse San Francisco:
—San Francisco Tomorrow Board Member
—Booker T. Washington/Ella Hill Hutch Board Member
—Strong Supporter: Mondale-Ferraro
—Steering Committee, San Francisco Plan Initiative
—Delegate candidate for Jesse Jackson
—Former staff, President’s Council of Economic Advisors
—Ph.D. (Economics, MIT)
—Co-author of three books
—Columnist, San Francisco Sun Reporter
—Priority focus: job creation programs for youth, minorities, and women
—Author, 1984 Ballot Proposition J which prohibits San Francisco pension fund investments in South Africa.

The sponsors for Julianne Malveaux are:
Jula C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
Judith Breck, 609 Kansas St., Lawyer, City Commissioner
Randall Bronner, 1390 Market St., Artist/Musician
Rene Cazeneve, 2821-32nd St., Housing Advocacy
Terence Faulkner, 2371 42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Thomas C. Fleming, 2171 O’Farrell St., Journalist
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Margaret P. Gannon, 3649-18th St., Attorney
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Yvonne S. Golden, 1743-9th Ave., School Administrator
Peter M. Good, 709 Shuhart St., Arborist
Robert Y. Hernandez, 852 Moultrie St., Director, Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer
Doti W. Kahn, 3259 Clay St., Transportation Commissioner
Tony Kiley, 473-11th Ave., President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Michael Kobeltz, 825 Masonic Ave., Distributor
Orelia Langston, 55 Friendship Way, Senior and Geriatric Specialist
Arthur Latham, 2350-48th Ave., Personnel Administrator
Michael C. Miller, 1920 Quint St., Attorney
Jack D. Morrison, 44 Woodland Ave., Management consultant
Carl Diablo Reece, 203-46th Ave., Graduate Student
Ruth Gordon Schnupp, 726-23rd Ave., Structural Engineer
Frances M. Shaskin, 259-32nd Ave., Consumer Rights Advocate
Anita Silvers, 15 Osage St., Professor, S.F. State
Arlo Smith, 66 Fernando Way, District Attorney
Bruce M. St Cyr, 343 Chester Ave., Vice President AFSCME
Local 2620
Ida V. Strickland, 1664 Fulton St., Administrator
Calvin Welch, 519 Ashbury St., Community Consultant

JOHN L. MOLINARI

My address is 30 16th Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: To make San Francisco work takes both good ideas and cooperation with everyone.
For over 12 years as your Supervisor, my contribution has been to bring together both the diverse viewpoints of San Francisco’s many communities and the other Supervisors to solve our City’s problems. With your support, I’ve:
—Promoted the construction of more housing; limited condominium conversions to protect renters; protected tenants from rent gougers and outrageous security deposits;
—Initiated escort services to protect seniors;
—Initiated preferential parking and parking ticket amnesty programs;
—Protected our neighborhood character from big companies forcing out small merchants; and
—Protected San Francisco’s parks and playgrounds.

The sponsors for John L. Molinari are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
George Christopher, 1176 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
John Francis Foran, 900 Rockdale Dr., State Senator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Romero Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Louise K. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Homemaker/Media Producer
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 11 Lunado Way, Pastor
H. Welton Flynan, 76 Venus St., Member, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Pastor
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director, Patient Advocacy
Gordon J. Lau, 540 19th Ave., Member, Port Commission
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Duke J. Armstrong, 352 Divisadero St., Former President, C.R.I.R.
Paul Boneberg, 647-A Castro St., President, Stonewall Gay Political Club
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, Community United Against Violence
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter (B.A.R.)
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Member, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Political Club
Sal Roselli, 349 Lexington Way, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Political Club
Maureen J. Conroy, 650 Eucalyptus Dr., Homemaker
John W. Hoitzcaw, 1508 Taylor St., Chair, Sierra Club Bay Chapter
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus
Michael S. Salarno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Sunset District Merchant

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Senior Health Care Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I am a political progressive with extensive professional experience as an administrator, program consultant, mediator, and service provider. These skills and my perspective will be valuable additions to the Board.

My commitment to economic and social justice is backed by 25 years of community service to ethnic and cultural minorities, women, low- and moderate-income families, elders, youth, gay people, small businesses, workers, the disabled, and government policy-makers.

I support neighborhood preservation, affordable housing measures (including rent control), jobs and job training for San Franciscans, comparable worth, and environmental safeguards.

I am a parent and San Francisco homeowner.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:
Priscilla Alexander, 745 Haight St., Feminist Activist
Zohn F. Artman, 141 Albion St., Media Consultant
Michael Bernick, 378 Golden Gate Ave., Executive Director, SF Renaissance
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing Manager
Diana Christensen, 36 Sanchez St., Executive Director, CUAV
Dennis M. Collins, 145-27th St., Political Consultant
Greg Day, 2260 Market St., Youth Services Director
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Attorney/Teacher
Walter E. Ems, 188 Eureka St., Retired
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 765 Geneva Ave., Confidential Secretary
Roma Guy, 583 Missouri St., Co-Director, The Women’s Foundation
Kenneth W. Jones, 600 Fillmore St., Office Manager; SF AIDS Foundation
Linda Jupiter, 2768-22nd St., Book Production Manager
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Senior Services Administration
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Sandy Cuvee Mor, 360 Presidio Ave., Administrator
Jane McKaske Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired Police Commissioner
Connie O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant, S.F. Sheriff’s Department
Juanita Owens, 371 Coleridge St., Educator/Administrator
Tish A. Pearman, 464 Duboce Ave., Writer/Photographer
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Political Activist
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Union Business Representative
Marguerite Rubenstein, 46 Stillings Ave., Therapist
Stephen H. Walters, 1223 Diamond St., Fundraiser

JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS

My address is 1203 Clayton Street
My occupation is Executor (Probate Attorney)
My qualifications for office are: This is not New York. My grandfather worked for this city for thirty-six years; helping to make San Francisco the greatest place on earth in which to live. Now our city bus system has to go hat in hand to Los Angeles to borrow buses. The quality of care at our general hospital has come under extreme question. The city of love, tolerance, and understanding is becoming more and more divided by every hate on earth. I, as a fourth generation San Franciscan, call upon you to join with us natives in the fight to keep San Francisco San Francisco.

Joseph James Phillips

The Sponsors for Joseph J. Phillips are:
Margaret Moskovitz Berzin, 2201 Lake St., Retired
Ernest Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
Amelia Sheehan, 436-27th Ave., Homemaker
Salvador Garza, 795 Brunswick St., Businessman
Gerald E. Gallagher, 2282-34th Ave., Retired
Jean M. McDermott, 325-9th Ave., Tax Preparer
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Juanita G Cardinelli, 1215-18th St., Retired
Peter G. Economou, 2040 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Laura Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Volunteer for Handicapped
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Consuelo G. Macdonald, 801-44th Ave., Retired
Roger Boschetti, 20 Carmelita St., Television Producer
Jody S. Hirota, 571-19th Ave., Dental Hygienist
Maurice C. Bihan, 111 Willard North St., Salesman
Kelly Lyon, 435-25th Ave., Secretary
Ralph A. Barsi, 1236 Athens St., Retired Teamster
Laura B. Campbell, 1275-32nd Ave., NOW
William E. Bayers, Jr., 3232 Geary Blvd, Printer
Pearle Wong, 1555 Shrader St., Housewife
Sophia E. Conley, 2845 Cabrillo St., Teacher
Jimmy Starr, 23 Boardman Pl., Lawyer
Hannah Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
John L. Santiago, 150 Woodland Ave., Retired
Walter J. Murphy, 767 Corbett Ave., Retired
Carl H. Hoppe, 100 Hamilton St., Retired
Jack I. Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
Sam Kekstine, 84 Lopez Ave., Self Employed
Helen Marie Sheehan, 875-38th Ave., Housewife

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

LOUISE RENNE

My address is 3725 Jackson Street
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: As Finance Committee chairperson, I have protected vital services while cutting wasteful expenditures. Sound policies have been implemented. San Francisco is on solid financial footing.

At the same time I played a leadership role in legislation affecting the environment, health care, Muni, the arts, indeed all San Franciscans (including our seniors and children).

My prior experience includes Deputy Attorney General, Criminal and Environmental Units; argued cases in Supreme Court; President, California Women Lawyers.

As an effective Supervisor, I pledge to continue my hard work, to act responsibly and compassionately, and to speak honestly on the critical issues affecting all San Franciscans.

Louise Renne

The sponsors for Louise Renne are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman 16th District
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli St., Public Relations
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4409-20th St., Youth Director—CYO—Urban Development
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Pres. Airport Commission
Susan J. Berman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Harry G. Britt, 783A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lucca Way, Minister
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Thomas J. Cahill, 246-17th Ave., Chief of Police, Retired
Lily Cuneo, 3819 Jackson St., Housewife
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President, Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Vice President, ILGWU
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman/Commissioner
John S. Jennings, 2743 San Bruno Ave., Realtor (Ret.)
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director of ILWU
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
Leslie M. Lawrence, 2423 Broadway, Certified Public Accountant
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner and Attorney
Melvin D. Lee, 450-22nd Ave., Engineer (Commissioner, S.F. Redevelopment Agency)
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Cyril Magnin, One Nob Hill Cir., Philanthropist
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor, State of California
Louise Ogden, 1674 Fillbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Business Representative
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Investment Advisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, SF Board of Supervisors
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CAROL RUTH SILVER

My address is 68 Ramona Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: Experience: Seven years a San Francisco Supervisor; twenty years a practicing attorney; mother of two.
—Responsiveness to neighborhoods:
—preserving sunlight in parks
—outlawing gay discrimination
—creating low and moderate income housing
—repairing City streets and buildings
—rent control
—protecting Chinatown merchants
—S.A.F.E. and Senior Escort Programs
—Neighborhood Arts Programs
—reducing smog
—preserving San Francisco Bay
—expanding Muni
—wheelchair accessibility
—more women and minorities receiving City contracts
—child care
I will continue to insist on fairness.

The Sponsors for Carol Ruth Silver are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
George Agnost, 2131 Funston Ave., City Attorney
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., San Francisco Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., San Francisco Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, 335 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., San Francisco Supervisor
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, President, Airport Commission
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Utilities Commissioner
Emmett D. Condon, 2506-21st Ave.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Tim M. Dayanot, 645 Randolph St., Charity Media Specialist
Teresa E. Griffin, 839-31st Ave., Retired Teacher
Vivian Hallinan, 1089 Chestnut St., Retired
Samuel Jordon, 4006-3rd St., Caterer
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Civic Engineer
Lim F. Lee, 1056 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Arthur/Education
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Realtor
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Business Representative
Jack Trujillo, 74 Ramona St., Word Processor

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

DAVID C. SMITH

My address is 2567 Alemany Blvd
My occupation is Administrator, Service Agency
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: I am a San Francisco State graduate in journalism, married, with a deep affection for this place. For several years my wife and I have counseled families and individuals from every neighborhood in San Francisco—an investment and commitment to the future. Dealing with these problems has increased my awareness of this city's growing precoccupation with rights and shrinking concern for responsibilities. The solution includes a return to basics, to strong family units, to solid values, to the worth of all human life. I will be a voice for those who feel excluded, especially exploited children and the disadvantaged.

David C. Smith

The sponsors for David C. Smith are:

James Bailey, Sr., 422 Guerrero St., Minister
Lillian P. Bailey, 422 Guerrero St., Housewife
Janis Ann Bell, 195 Sadoawa St., Secretary
Jeffrey Belt, 195 Sadoawa St., Photographer
Robert R. Carlson, 337 Baden St., Radio Producer
Victoria A. Carlyle, 1808 Octavia St., Political Analyst
John William Castro, 3 Plymouth St., Mover
John Frederick Decker, 1060 Eddy St., Designer
Frances Edwards, 2554 Alemany Blvd., Housewife
Daisy Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., Homemaker
David Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., High School President
James W. Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Police Officer
Jean Higgins, 3341 San Bruno Ave., Student
James L. Higgs, 270 Juanita Way, Pastor
Margaret M. Lee, 730-12th Ave., Secretary
Mark W. Lee, 881 Silver Ave., President, Simpson College
Arvid Lindgren, 2531 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Norma Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Secretary
Philip Litton, 3340 San Bruno Ave., Student
John A. McGeethan, 1230 LaPlaya St., Military, U.S. Army
Charles A. McIlnany, 1380 Lawton St., Clergy
J. Thad McKinney, 766 Kansas St., Station Manager
Marilyn G. Miller, 518 Dewey Blvd., Secretary
Chris Montgomery, 518 Dewey Blvd., Church Worker
Lawrence W. Pong, 254 Arch St., Environmental Health Inspector
James Douglas Robinson, 1319-7th Ave., Moving Company Manager
James W. Robinson, 518 Dewey Blvd., Executive Director of a Christian Service Organization
Constance B. Steinbach, 180 Lippard Ave., Homemaker

The sponsors for Kevin Starr are:

Richard B. Allen, 2111 Franklin St., Merchant
Lynn A. Alshuler, 1490 Sacramento St., Attorney
Thomas E. Anderson, 236 Moneada Way, Clergyman
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Job Training Director
Gino Biradelli, 700 Columbus Ave., Restauranteur
Sam Canihi, 265 San Anselmo Ave., Insurance Estate Planner
Frank J. Caufield, 1034 Chestnut St., Venture Capital Investor
Vyloet L. Chu, 1282 Vallejo St., Asian Art Commissioner
Elizabeth A. Cooley, 2820 Scott St., Legal Assistant
Paul Denning, 2165 California St., Investment Banker
Martin Eng, 665 Pine St., County Central Committee Member
James W. Haas, 163 Prospect Ave., Attorney
Patrick E. Hallman, 117-27th Ave., Attorney
Walter E. Hoadley, 900 Green St., Economist
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Allan S. Johnson, 165 Prospect Ave., Consultant
Dorrwin Buck Jones, 245 Northpoint St., Gerontologist; Director, Meals on Wheels
Harold K. Lipset, 2509 Pacific Ave., Private Investigator
Frances A. Lopez, 1474 Sacramento St., Paralegal
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Editor
John Maher, 795-8th Ave., Executive
Roxanne Manlin, 1212 Pacific Ave., Investment Real Estate
Michael Marston, 3375 Jackson St., Real Estate and Development Consultant
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave., Asst. Business Manager, Local #38
John N. Rosekrans, Jr., 2840 Broadway, Businessman, Toy Manufacturer
Michael S. Sarallo, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Businessman
Michael Strunsky, 2265 Bay St., Construction Executive
Brooks Walker, Jr., 2930 Broadway, Business Executive
Suzan Yee, 632-6th Ave., Attorney

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
JOHN E. WAHL
My address is 118C Connecticut Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: I have a 20 year record of voluntary, unpaid public service to San Francisco. I have worked with all levels of City government, with people in all parts of the City. Examples of my public service include being a Judge Pro Tem of the San Francisco Municipal Court, 9 years of service on the Board of the San Francisco Council of Churches, service on the Pride Foundation Board, and service to veterans.

I am dedicated to ensuring affordable places to live, a responsible and unprejudiced police department, decent jobs, and dependable transportation.

I am independent of special interest club politics.

John E. Wahl

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN
My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is Staff-writer for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 58

My qualifications for office are: My program:

Courts, cops and strikebreaking injunctions; two-gate, two-tiered, union-busting tactics, are helping employers depress living standards. Escalating health, housing and food costs are forcing working people—especially Blacks and Latinos—out of San Francisco. Corporate condos and highrises replace workers' residences.

Door-key children of working parents, denied childcare, are left to roam the streets. Abortion clinics are under siege.

Only united labor—employed, unemployed, black, white—can change this condition. An independent labor party, based on the unions, must be built to replace the callous politicians of the two ruling capitalist parties.

Jobs not war!

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for John F. Wahl are:
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, Community
College Board
Caroleen W. Marks, 55 Jordan Ave., Economist and Civic Leader
James E. Sandmire, 452 Buchanan St., Minister
E. Patricia (Pat) Lucey, 69 Huntington Dr., Attorney
Benjamin L. Marcus, 84 Winfield St., Rabbi and Chaplain
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Walter W. Grumm, 3126-22nd St., Clergyperson
Ann Marie Day, 136 Delmar St., Retired Social Worker
Cleve Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Aide
Paul S. Yein, 342-8th Ave., Real Estate Agent
Hank Wilson, 1651 Market St., Hotel Operator
Fred L. Kurlander, 115 San Aleso, Attorney
Jean Wall Burgess, 421 Moraga Ave., Lawyer
Gary E. Myerscough, 156 Sproule Ln., Education Administrator
Paula F. Lichtenberg, 925 Jones St., Paralegal
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author, Retired Publisher
Jerry G. Guerra, 85 Fortuna St., Retailer
Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr., M.D. 2170 Hayes St., Physician
Foster W. Weeks, 1910 Greenwich St., Advertising Consultant
Shirley Kaiser, 806-33rd Ave., Teacher
Robert W. Shore, 146 Guerrero St., Businessman
Rosa M. Kwong, 512 Van Ness Ave., Law Student
Charlene Yamato, 416 Font Blvd., Secretary
Jeanette Sibley, 75 Woodhaven Ct., Classroom Teacher
Alan Thompson Smith, 190 Palo Alto Ave., Small Business Owner
William Earl Andrews, 4130 Army St., Taxi Driver
Larry E. Hughes, 87 Fortuna St., Paralegal/Consultant
Julita V. De Chavez, 1591-45th Ave., Deputy County Clerk

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:
Alan A. Benjamin, 2783-20th St., Editor, Socialist Action
Paul Colvin, 558-56th Ave., Printer
Nancy G. Elnor, 615 Central Ave., Teacher
Ralph P. Forsyth, 77 Cedro St., Teacher
May May Gong, 23 Bessee St., Power Plant Operator
Nancy L. Gruber, 921 Alvord St., Editor
Millie B. Gonzalez, 2543-32nd Ave., Student
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Longshoreman
Ruth Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Office Worker
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297-18th St., Retail Clerk
William G. Leumer, 535 Day St., Mechanic
Ann Menasche, 2149-48th Ave., Feminist Attorney
Linda I. Ray, 3740-25th St., Registered Nurse
Ann A. Robertson, 535 Day St., Professor
Joseph M. Ryan, 25 Bessee St., Machinist
Karen A. Schieve, 3575-19th St., Sales Clerk
Michael William Schreiber, 3593 Mission St., Muni Driver
Carole Seligman, 245 Whitney St., Muni Bus Driver
Kathryn Setian, 1364-16th Ave., Engineer
Margery Jean VanDerslice, 1540-20th St., Registered Nurse
Christine Vaughn, 1255 Polk St., Poster or Clerk
David Walters, 2543-32nd Ave., Power Plant Operator
Bonnie Weinstein, 1716 Revere Ave., Student
Deborah Weinstein, 1830 Church St., Unemployed Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 489-27th St., Painter

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

DAVE WHARTON

My address is 5031 Diamond Heights Blvd.
My occupation is Community Service Attorney
My age is 44


It's time for housing expansion, for transit, traffic, parking overhaul. Time for better City services, especially for seniors and youth. Time to strengthen economy, create jobs, control taxes. Time for neighborhood revitalization, parking relief. Time for human rights advancement, efficient and humane police services. Experiment with Board meetings in neighborhoods.

It's time for goals, results, citizen participation. San Francisco is world class city, small town; lose either, be neither. I build bridges, not barriers. Join our common sense coalition.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:

Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Libby Denenberg, 200 St Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Douglas Chan, 396 Spruce St., Attorney/Rent Board Commissioner
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Russell Flynn, 2815 Pacific Ave., Real Estate/Rent Board Commissioner
Charles B. Renfrew, 791-14th Ave., Attorney/Former Federal Judge
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Hotel/Real Estate Executive
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Alicia Wang, 1418 Leavenworth St., Educational Specialist
Mortimer Fleishacker, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Investor
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
Diane C. Kefauver, 1728 Great Highway, Consultant
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Union President/Retired
Jose Gomez, 59 Grandview Ave., Legal Services/Executive Director
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
John L. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Insurance/Savings and Loan Chairman
Phyllis Kern, 306 Arbor St., Labor Union Secretary
Russell I. Kassman, 2454 Bush St., Businessman
Laura E. McBride, 925 Cole St., Typographer
George M. Raya, 90 Verna Ct., City Employee
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Development Executive
Gloria Armijo, 727 Pine St., Travel Agent
Lawrence A. Wilson, 333-A Pierce St., Attorney—Community Volunteer
Deborah R. Pines, 4248-20th St., Financial Consultant
John T. McAlister, Jr, 999 Green St., Businessman
Bobbie Griffin, 50 Leland Ave., District Attorney Investigator
Edith Welin, 165-A Alpine Ter., Teacher

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

DICK CERBATOS
My address is 471 Hoffman Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have always been deeply interested in the education of youth. Before my appointment to the Board of Education two years ago, I served twenty years on Citizens' Advisory and PTA committees focusing on education. As an engineer business-owner, I also bring professional skills to the Board.

As a first generation American, I am sympathetic to minority children's problems, and aware that public education is the golden gateway to opportunity and success. I intend to continue pressing for higher test scores, improved discipline and morale, less truancy, and an increase in college admissions.

I am committed to excellence in education.

A. Richard Cerbatos

The sponsors for Dick Cerbatos are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Ave., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Lawyer
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Bovect, 234 Gates St., Attorney at Law
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Diana Christensen, 52 Sanchez St., Executive Director
Judy Dellamonica, 3323 Taraval St., President, San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President-Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Eugene S. Hopp, 508 Van Ness Ave., Physician
Thomas, E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Ralph F. Hurtado, 65 Newburg St., Executive Director
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Labor-Vice President, ILGWU
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir. ILGWU
Mrya G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Bette Wallace Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Cir., Homemaker
Wendy Nelder, 150 Castitas Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, S.F. Board of Supervisors
A. Ceci Williams, 60 Hilaritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON
My address is 29 Oliver Street
My occupation is Transit Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I was born and raised in San Francisco, graduating from Balboa High.

For the past 7 years I have been active in the school district having been elected to 2 terms on the District Advisory Committee, 4 years as the chairperson of the Pelton Academic Middle School Parent's Group, and 5 years on the site advisory council at Pelton.

I am married and have 2 children attending Commodore Sloat Elementary School.

I believe there is much work needed to provide the quality education our children need to prepare them for a highly technical society of computers and robotics.

Chris Christenson

The sponsors for Christopher Christenson are:
Essie L. Webb, 186 Maddux Ave., Intake & Referral Specialist
Raymond Tunstall, 515 John Muir Dr., Deputy Sheriff
Francis Smyth, 1709-16th Ave., Deputy Sheriff
Harry E. Jensen, III, 74 Delmonte St., Electrical Transit Manager
Joe W. Turner, 1274 Palou Ave., Janitor Supervisor II
Martin Larkin, 4733 Lincoln Way, Paint Supervisor
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Supervisor II
Joseph Delia Rosa, 91 Oliver St., Seaman
Precious Moore, 2046 Thomas Ave., Home Health Aide
Liana Sand Dune Kastina, 524 Clipper St., Clerk Typist
William Satchell, 500 Francisco St., Transit Car Cleaner
Roy W. Hove, 576 Libon St., Marble Shopman
Guadalupe Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Jeanne L. Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Grocery Clerk
Roosevelt Lancaster, 170 Ledyard St., Transit Car Cleaner
Lena M. Quintana, 3351 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Alfred Lent, 1475 Church St., Electrical Mechanic
George Williams, Sr., 335 Hearst Ave., Retired
Beatrice L. Dunbar, 430 Thornton Ave., Retired
Vicente Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Driver
Gabriel, R. Wilkerson, 1347-15th Ave., Cashier

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
LIBBY DENEBEIM

My address is 200 St. Francis Blvd.
My occupation is Incumbent School Board Member

My qualifications for office are: Four years ago you elected me to the school board. I am deeply grateful.

I have worked hard. Student achievement scores improved, enrollment stabilized. We strengthened significantly special programs and alternative schools.

There remains much work to do. As a mother of six public school educated children, former teacher and experienced school board member, I know how our schools should work.

Many children today will finish school in the 21st Century. For all our children we must plan for the future, reaffirm our commitment to excellence, use school dollars prudently and ensure the momentum for improvement in our schools continues.

Libby Deneheim

The sponsors for Libby Deneheim are:

Robert S. Deneheim, 200 St Francis Blvd., Businessman
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Sala Burton, 5 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
William K. Coblentz, 10-3th Ave., Attorney
Patricia F. Costello, 2838 Green St., Community Leader
Carlota T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Diane Feinstein, 2020 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Zuretti L. Gosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA Volunteer
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Cynthia Brown Kelly, 460 Magellan St., Homemaker
Myra G. Kopf, 1540-15th Ave., Board of Education Member
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-549th Ave., Attorney
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan St., Lt. Governor
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Attorney/Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., Mental Health Director
John L. Molinaro, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
Philip Bruce Rafal, 902 Clayton St., SF Open Space Committee Member
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor/Gay Leader
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher/President, SF Federation of Teachers
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Yori Wada, 566-4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Pam Fonzio Waller, 649 San Jose Ave., Contract Compliance Representative
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Malcolm S.M. Watts, 270 Seacfrif Ave., Physician

GEORGE DYKSTRA

My address is 949 Filbert Street
My occupation is Community Services Director
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am trained in government finance and Citizen Participation decision making. Long community involvement includes director, Educational Services, Executive Board of Golden Gate Child Development, Saint Mary's Hospital Board and Yick Wo Elementary Parent's Committee. My education includes a B.A., emphasizing Education and U.S.C. graduate school.

I am practical, experienced and positive. I expect more from students, parents and teachers. I promise fiscal responsibility. I respect and support parent participation, teacher professionalism and every student's right to learn in well-equipped, orderly schools. Opportunity, Technology and Basics.

Vote for me! I will keep children in the picture.

George Dykstra

The sponsors for George Dykstra are:

Lisa Bardaro, M.D., 880 Sloat Blvd., Physician
Millicent E. Buxton, 80 Parnassus Ave., Educator
Robert T. Corrado, 18 Miramar Ave., Administrator
Teresa M. D'Auray, 75 Heather St., Environmental Fund Raising
Kathleen DePaola, 949 Filbert St., Psychologist
Kathleen Dykstra, 949 Filbert St., Legal Administrator
Linda J. Gaudreau, 858-26th Ave., Director of Medical Records
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grant St., Attorney-at-Law
Ann K. Howell-Isom, 904 Courtland Ave., Volunteer Coordinator
D. S. Inaba, 44 Escondido Ave., Associate Professor
Martha Anne Jessup, 2562 Diamond St., Educator
Deborah L. Keller, 1461-41 Ave., Student
Katherine Lambert, 63 Winfield St., Women's Services Consultant
Mim Landry, 1040 Cole St., Student
Nick Ledderer, 79 Mizpah St., Executive Director, Senior Services
Dr. Thomas S. McCoy, 1446 Clay St., Professor
Tim P. Mess, M.D.D.S. Lundy's La., AIDS Clinician-Researcher
Susan L. Mok, 1352-38th Ave., Acupuncturist
Marcia Quackenbush, 1690-27th Ave., Social Worker
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director
CAHEED

Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Director of Health
Kenneth M. Sims, 1454 Palou Ave., Associate Director Child Development Center
David E. Smith, 80 Parnassus Ave., Physician
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Monticello St., Attorney
Michael Stepanian, 2109 Baker St., Attorney
Harvey W. Q. Teh, 70 Lomita Ave., Businessman
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas, Methodist Minister
E. Leif Zerkin, 1326-26th Ave., Editor

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

MARTIN ENG

My address is 665 Pine Street
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant

My qualifications for office are: Twelve years of community and civic service.

Issues
Eng supports:
• Our children's inherent right for education.
• Regain respect for our teachers.
• Tight measures to halt school violence. Stop the sale and use of street drugs.
• Higher standards for teachers and students.
• Encourage teachers and parents participation within the Board.

• Merit pay to outstanding teachers.

Maximize income: Lease surplus school properties. End mismanagement by incompetent Board members.

Eng opposes:
• Current programs teaching alternative lifestyle to our precious children. A violation of the First Amendment.

• Board members extravagant dinner meetings with liquor paid for by taxpayers. A blatant violation of the law.

Martin Eng

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:

John Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Real Estate Broker, Former Supervisor
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Commissioner, Contractors State License Board, State of California
Lee S. Dalsom, 1755 Beach St., Professor, Former Supervisor
Dr. John B. Tsu, 2 Denaskow Dr., Education Commissioner
Melvin M. Belli, 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
John B. Ritchie, 2 Preordial Ter., Landmark Preservation Board
Steven J. Doi, 1252 Lark St., Attorney
C. Mackey E. Salazar, 183 San Benito Way, City Planning Commissioner
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli St., Retired
John T. Fang, 170 Gelbert Dr., Publisher, State Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Robert Silvestri, 3000-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Anna Kyle Paeuwan, 50 Cunningham Pt., Legal Assistant
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Vice President, District One Political Action
Kevin G. Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Property Consultant
John S. Tang, M.D. 2184 Funston Ave., Physician
Timothy A. Elta, 279 Ashbury St., Attorney
Jung Roy Gee, 665 Pine St., Investor, Education Researcher
William Bernstein, 1000 Franklin St., Attorney
Robert P. Varni, 10 Miller Pl., Chairman-Police Data Systems
Frank S. Yee, 356 Los Palmas Dr., Real Estate Finance, Teacher
Rev. Charles A. McIlhenny, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
William Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney at Law
F. Theodore Kiff, 2801 Broadway, Lawyer
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis Ter., V.P. Branch Manager, S & L
Velma Petersallie, 665 Pine St., Teacher
Ed Pond, 16-30th Ave., Insurance broker/Accountant
S.M. Saroyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Business Enterprises/Lawyer
Frank N. Allutto, 2895 Vallejo St., Restaurant Owner
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., 440 Coret Ave., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Assn.

EUGENE S. HOPP, M.D.

My address is 601 Van Ness Avenue, Opera Plaza
My occupation is Physician

My qualifications for office are: For the past thirteen years I have served on the Board of Education as an independent voice committed to the goal of educating all our children to their fullest potential. The current stress on teaching the basics must continue, combined with offerings of high technology and vocational courses designed to prepare our diverse student population for a changing future. I stand for an integrated educational program and welcome parents and the public to assist me in this challenge.

Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Eugene S. Hopp are:

Molly M. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Telecommunications Executive
Dianne Feinstein, 3020 Lyon St., Mayor
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Attorney
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Supervisor
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Somedra M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, Vice President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission
Bruce A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Police Commissioner
Alfred J. Neider, 150 Castitas Ave., Police Commissioner
Alan S. Wong 1280 Ellis St., Commissioner, Community College
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member S.F. Community College
John F. Crowley, 87 Los Palnos Dr., Labor Official
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Amos J. Castro, 1401 California St., Physician
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Civil Rights Administrator
Harry Polland, 637 Powell St., Economist
Saul Medals, 75 Country Club Dr., Retired, School Admin.
Jo Birnbach, 1750 Taylor St., Housewife
Anita H. Sanchez, 44 Restani Way, Social Worker
Chadwick C. Ertola, 660 Greenwich St., Attorney
Naomi Grey, 1291 Stanyan St., Businesswoman
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
Raye G. Richardson, 1714 Fillmore St., Assoc. Professor
Max L. Christensen, 2 Heath Ave., Clergyman
Leo J. Murphy, Sr., 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Lane E. De Lara, 2 Lenox Way, Educational Consultant
Gregory C. Lintner, 2660 Webster St., Realtor

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

TERRY HUGUNIN

My address is 1824 Noriega Street
My occupation is Consultant
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: Those of us who were teenagers during President Kennedy's Appolo Space Program thought there was nothing we and our nation might not accomplish: “We're going to the moon in ten years!” Thanks to outfits like the National Education Association, the science oriented New Frontiers of the 60's have given way to the "other-directedness" of the Aquarian Age. Their goal: form a society of androgynous pacifists—study their literature. Mine is to restore the problem-solving orientation appropriate to Judeo-Christian culture. Help me mobilize our schools to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative and overcome the nuclear war threat.

Terry Hugunin

The sponsors for Terry Hugunin are:

Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Gricelis Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Letcia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Forklift Operator
Michael Fazio, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative

JAMES LEGARE

My address is 254 Oak Street
My occupation is Motor Truck Operator
My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I am committed to installing a sound educational program in our schools as the basis for getting our country and economy moving again-in the American tradition. We need to develop young minds through a program of classical education and to protect them by wiping out drugs in the schools and in the nation.

I propose to reform the school system along these lines:

1) Classical geometry and physics, as typified by Plato, Archimedes, Cusa Kepler, and Leibniz
2) Classical poetry, music, and drama, exemplified by Homer, Aeschylus, Dante, Shakespeare, Schiller, Bach, and Beethoven

James Legare

The sponsors for James Legare are:

Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Gricelis Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Letcia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Forklift Operator
Michael Fazio, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JO ANNE MILLER

My address is 1920 Quint Street
My occupation is Parent and Teacher
My qualifications for office are: I am the mother of two children in San Francisco Public Schools. I believe in the Public School System, and have a personal interest in its quality and effectiveness. I am a teacher of the blind. I am President of the Glen Park School Site Advisory Committee, and hold other elected civic offices.

The lack of parent representation on the School Board has contributed to a lack of parent and citizen involvement, a lack of long-term planning and vision in school administration, and a failure to commit the School District to a plan and goal of excellence for all children.

JoAnne Miller

BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones Street
My occupation is Transportation Analyst
My qualifications for office are: I believe I have provided outstanding leadership during my eight years on the San Francisco Board of Education. This is evidenced by the fact that test scores have improved and new programs have attracted students back from private schools.

As an active parent, I know San Francisco's schools first-hand. I have worked conscientiously for our children's future. I have the vision and I have gained the practical skills necessary to continue building our school district into one of the best large urban districts in the nation.

Benjamin Tom

The sponsors for JoAnne Miller are:
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Angel D. Contras, 1461 Alabama St., Administrator of Headstart
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 DenaG St., President, San Francisco NOW
Linda Fries, 820-35th Ave., Community Organizer
Bob Geary, 2587 Great Highway, San Francisco Police Officer
Louise Harvey, 673 Fulton St., Educational Consultant
Marilee Hearn, 3030 Turk Blvd., Teacher
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Ron Huberman, 61 Walter St., District Attorney Investigator
Darro Inouye, 251 Gates St., Attorney
Cleve Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Assistant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir., ILWU
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Jean E. Kornum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member of Board of Supervisors
Peter Mezey, 3392 Clay St., Business Executive
Hugh B. Miller, 355 Roosevelt Way, Attorney
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
James E. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Taxi Cab Owner
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director, CAHEED, Inc.
Jerry Ringerman, 485 Crestmont Dr., Executive Director, San Francisco Jewish Community Center
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everston St., Performing Arts Administrator
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis St., Member, Board of Supervisors
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., President, AAFUM

The sponsors for Ben Tom are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Supervisor, San Francisco
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commission
William K. Cobletz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director, CYO
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Ben L. Hom, 1 Villa Ter., Banker, Executive
Alan S. Wong, 1230 Ellis St.; Social Worker, Community College Board Member
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director, Pre-Trial Diversion Project
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor, City and County
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Board Member School Administrator
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Business Representative
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembleyman, 16th District

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Candidates for College Board

ERNEST "CHUCK" AYALA
My address is 4402-20th Street
My occupation is Youth Director, CYO-Urban Development Division

My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan, South of Market neighborhood. Attended public and parochial schools, including City and Lone Mountain Colleges. My involvement in community development and public service is with youth in Education, Employment and Delinquency Prevention, in addition to developing and administering Senior Citizens and Veterans Programs. Business management background in labor, insurance and real estate provides me with a balanced approach to fiscal and administrative objectives of the Community College District. My continued goal for the Community College District is to retain its open door policy and remain responsive to the educational and vocational needs of the people.

Ernest Chuck Ayala

The sponsors for Ernest "Chuck" Ayala are:
Reginald Y. Alexander, 182 Middlefield Dr., Vice Chancellor, Certificated
Bernice E. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Homemaker
Louis F. Batnialle, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College District
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, S.F. Community College Board
Vincent J. Callan, 4038 19th St., Retired
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot St., House Wife
Marjorie M. Colvin, 1835 Franklin St. #1403, Housewife
Peter J. Fatao, 30 Grand View Ave., Businessman
William L. Fazio, 110 Inverness Dr., Asst District Attorney
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley St., Management Consultant
Al Graf, 859 Bryant St., Businessman
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonerest Dr., Contractor
Marcel Kapulica, 2470 22nd Ave., Dental Laboratory-Owner
Louis E. Laguer, 4001 21st St., District Manager, Packing Co.
Dorothy J. Lavelle, 15 Florentine St., Retired
Ernestine A. McGoldrick, 4442 20th St., School Clerk/Housewife
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., 1789 Eucalyptus St., State Assemblyman-Retired
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board

John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Susan Ann Roudides, 340-A Taraval St., Florist
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., President, S.F. Police Commission
Bob (Robert) Schmidt, 4048 21st St., Librarian
Thomastia N. Scott, 1912½ Broderick St., Youth Program Coordinator
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba St., Education/Police Commissioner
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Bernard J. Ward, 3300 Kirkham St., Atty at law
Bill Zorazakis, 545 Castro St., Shoe Repairer

AMOS CLEOPHILUS BROWN
My address is 111 Lunado Way
My occupation is Clergyman
My age is 43

My qualifications for office are: I hold the B.A., M.Div. and D.D. degrees. 16 years of public service on boards of education throughout the U.S. more than qualifies me for the position.

My services on the Board of Governors since 1982 reflect that I am competent and able to work with a team of governors to ensure the delivery of a quality education system for all persons in our community who desire training for marketable skills. Community College also must serve the needs of those who for various reasons have not had the opportunity of going to other institutions of higher learning for training.

Amos C. Brown

The sponsors for Amos C. Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, Community College Board
Priscilla A. Dennard, 210 Broad St., Secretary
James Gordon Emerson, Jr., 175 Beaumont St., Clergyman
Mayor Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Veneus St., Public Accountant
Dr. Howard S. Gilroy, 335 Noriega St., Minister
Zelma R. Harrison, 1937 Hayes St., Bookkeeper
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Grandvel A. Jackson, 257 Kensington Way, Retired
Clifton R. Jeffers, 1883 14th Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor
John L. Molinar, 30 16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Lauraret Newkirk, 354 Brussels St., System Support Librarian
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Naomi Shires, 756 Page St., Fiscal Clerk
Rabbi Malcolm M. Sparer, 1059 Clement St., Rabbi
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Nancy G. Walker, 335 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilirita St., Minister
Hannibal A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergyman
Tomothy R. Wolford, 91 Sanchez, President, College Board
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PATRICK C. FITZGERALD
My address is 128 Detroit Street
My occupation is San Francisco County Central Committee, 16th Assembly District.
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: • Am married, father of three children and a homeowner
• Graduated: St. Ignatius College Prep. and City College of San Francisco
• Elected San Francisco County Central Committeeman (since 1970)
• California State Central Committeeman (since 1978)
• Attended San Francisco 1984 National Presidential Convention for Mondale-Ferrero
• Served on San Francisco City Government CATV Task Force Educational Access Committee
• Instrumental in adoption of San Francisco City Labor Studies Program
• Great Nephew of former San Francisco County Supervisor Tom O'Dowd
• Past Secretary San Francisco County Central Committee
• Strong opponent 1983 Feinstein Recall
• Successfully fought peripheral canal
• Support Propositions: 33 (disabled homeowners) and 40 (political campaign reform).

Patrick C. Fitzgerald

DEAN GOODMAN
My address is 825 Geary Street #703
My occupation is Retired Teacher/Actor
My age is 64
My qualifications for office are: Thirty years of teaching, an educator’s concern for quality instruction, and a citizen’s awareness of the need for budget control. As the first fulltime president of the Community College Federation of Teachers, Local 2121 and as a former staff member of the District I know well the policies and procedures which form the structure of the Community College and the College Centers.

If elected, I will insist on fair hiring practices, and as a member of that most diverse of all groups, our Senior Citizens, I will support college services for all adults regardless of individual differences.

Dean Goodman

The sponsors for Patrick C. Fitzgerald are:
Terry A. Francois, 20 Traval St., Attorney
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official
John J. Moylan, 2985-24th Ave., Labor Leader
Terence Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Marion L. Francois, 20 Traval St., Social Worker
Patricia K. Mooser, 1762-17th Ave., Tax Consultant/Bookkeeper
Josephine Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Central Committee
Commissioner

The sponsors for Dean Goodman are:
Prisilla Alden, 1677 Bush St., #8, Actress
Ugo Baldassari, 998 Dolores St., Theatre Director
James E. Ballard, 2 Arbor St., Teacher
Sheldon I. Balman, 3 Perro 1er., Attorney
Laurent R. Broussal, 855 Quintana St., Administrator, Community College
Kimo Cochran, 1330 Bush St., Bar Owner
Donald G. Climent, 117 Ord St., Refugee Resettlement Counselor
Lauri Fried-Lee, 435 19th Ave., Community College Instructor
William Gundel, 1415 Franklin St., Credit Adjuster
Frances T. Hughes, 2649 Polk St., Legal Secretary
Donna Bylin, 76 6th Ave., Counselor
Lynda Bergman, 24 Magnolia St., Singer/Actress
Michael J. Mandel, 12 Marne St., Attorney
Donna L. Miller, 26 Leo St., Furniture Manufacturer
Jay Moran, 1667 Page St., Business Representative
Allen Nommon, 177 Bocana St., Theatrical Photographer
Judy Winn-Bell Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Teacher/Author/Editor
Roger E. W-B Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Publisher
Frank Reilly, 3415 Divisadero St., Advertising/Actor
James J. Reilly, 2059 Jefferson St., Attorney
Rev. James E. Sandmire, 452 Buchanan St., Minister
Eve Stoddard, 180 Diamond St., Probate Administration
Daniel A. Sullivan, 1590 Sacramento St., Attorney
Doug Triathan, 701 Taylor St., Pianist
Sigrid Wunschmidt, 1142 DeHarco St., Actress
Samuel L. Zanze, 2581 25th Ave., Businessman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ANDRE F. PEHARGOU

My address is 3840 Fulton Street
My occupation is Civil Servant
My qualifications for office are: I have been a resident of San Francisco for 34 years. I am a graduate of California State University San Francisco; San Francisco City College, and Lowell High School.

Most taxpayers are not benefitting from the Community College System due to lack of information and lack of convenient locations.

As a Board member, I will advocate a strong academic curriculum; More neighborhood locations to facilitate Senior citizens and working taxpayers; Better utilization of present facilities, and a decrease in tuition fees for City residents.

If you want expanded services to help benefit you, give me your support on election day.

Andre F. Pehargou

The sponsors for Adre F. Pehargou are:

JULIE TANG

My address is 788-18th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor's degree in Psychology from the University of San Francisco; Master's in Education from Stanford University; Juris Doctorate from Hastings College of Law; a wife, mother, former teacher and counselor; and presently, Assistant District Attorney in San Francisco.

I have served diligently, always conscious of my responsibility to all the communities of San Francisco who gave me the highest number of votes four years ago. I strive to ensure that the Community College will continue providing quality education to all students, even during financial crises, without sacrificing student or faculty needs. As the only woman board member, I actively support women's issues.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman John Yehal Chinn, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal Art Agnos, 657 Connecticut St., Assemblyman Harry G. Britt, 765-A Guerrero St., Member Board of Supervisors Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member Board of Supervisors Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., Univ of Calif Regent John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member Board of Supervisors Rosario Amaya, 240 Dolores St., Commissioner, Board of Education/School Administrator Arlo E. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant SF Sheriff's Dept.
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister Timothy R. Wolford, 91 Sanchez St., President, Community College Board Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member SF Community College Board
Madeleine C. Russell, 3778 Washington St., Investments Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner Agripino R. Cebato, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer Michael Hennessy, 201 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco Anne Bellisle Dalsey, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Director Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Members SF Board of Supervisors Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Community Activist Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Incumbent SF Supervisor Betty W. Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer Ron Huberman, 81 Waller St., District Attorney's Investigator Jeffrey K. Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director
Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 910 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Educator

My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

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

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

Dr. Tim Wolfred

The sponsors for Dr. Tim Wolfred are:

Sara Burton, 8 Stotar Blvd., Congresswoman
Willie Brown, 1200 Gough St., Assembly Member
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembly Member
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff, City and County of San Francisco

The sponsors for Moy Velasquez are:

Lilian Alda, 231 Granada Ave., Teacher
Concepcion G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Teacher
Melandor Busto, 49 Capp St., Student
Victoriano G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Mechanic
Stasia Cagara, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Sales
Rosita T. Castaneda, 18 Guy Pl., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion P. Caspeles, 931 Prague St., Teacher
Cheryl R. Conrad, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student
Theresa N. Fabro, 4186 Mission St., School Lunchroom Manager
Kenneth A. Guerra, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Technician
Odelia Jones, 1775 Newcomb Ave., Housekeeper
Felisa P. Mijena, 266 Brighton Ave., School Lunch Helper
Buur C. Nickerson, 356-6th St., Self Employed
Willie B. Nicholas, 1231-5th Ave., Custodian
Jack Lee Ponewa, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Production Manager
Margaret M. Powers, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Customer Service
Clarice D. Robinson, 2445 Harrison St., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion A. Ramos, 2700 Fulton St., Room Cleaner
Murdie Washington, 195 Highland St., Monitor
David A. Woodard, 397 Green St., Chef
**Port Revenue Bonds**

**PROPOSITION A**

Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Port Commission operates the Port of San Francisco. When funds are needed for Port construction or improvements, the Commission may issue revenue bonds to raise funds. A majority of the voters must approve these bonds before they can be issued. The revenue bonds are then paid from Port revenues.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition A would allow the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance several improvements of Port property. These improvements include modernizing container handling facilities, upgrading various piers, constructing a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf, and renovating certain other Port structures and property. The bonds would then be paid off from Port revenues.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance improvements of Port property.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want the Port Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

**Controller's Statement on “A”**

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

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

- Bond redemption $42,500,000
- Bond interest 81,761,400
- Total debt service requirement $124,261,400

"Based on a three year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning four years after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $4,462,000 to a maximum of $5,760,000 annually for twenty-seven years.

"In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Port revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Port sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Port. Analysis of projected resources available to the Port indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years."

**How Supervisors Voted on “A”**

On July 30 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on a motion placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

**NO:** Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

**TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 51.**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The revitalization of the Port of San Francisco will bring new jobs and new tax revenue to the City. A healthy port, with increased ship traffic, will bring millions each year to the San Francisco economy.

By delaying modernizations in the past, the Port of San Francisco lost the bulk of its maritime business to other Bay Area and West Coast cities. The same mistakes must not be made twice. We must allow the Port to use revenues to finance continued improvements.

Proposition A does not authorize any new taxes. Proposition A simply authorizes the Port to use revenues to finance improvements and expansion.

Proposition A will allow for the modernization of existing container cargo terminals on the southern waterfront. These improved facilities will retain current business and will bring new lines to San Francisco. The return of the shipping business will bring back long lost blue collar jobs to the waterfront as well as white collar jobs.

In addition, Proposition A will provide for expansion of the passenger facility, a new breakwater to protect the commercial fishing fleet, and improved rail access to the port. In all, Proposition A will upgrade and modernize San Francisco Port facilities so as to make them competitive with other ports across the Bay and throughout the West Coast.

The complete modernization effort will be done at no cost to the taxpayers. Instead, the Port of San Francisco’s income will be used to finance long-term revenue bonds.

The people of San Francisco deserve a first-rate port. We urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote YES on Proposition A.

As Mayor, I have worked hard to restore our port to its historic pre-eminence as a major gateway to the Far East.

Once again, major shipping lines are docking in San Francisco. Just recently, two of the largest container vessel operators, China Ocean Shipping Corporation and Columbus Lines, signed agreements to use this port.

Not only modern cargo carriers, but passenger liners as well are being drawn to San Francisco in a remarkable renaissance of maritime commerce.

But if there is to be a lasting renewal of our waterfront, the port must be competitive with other port cities anxiously contending for the burgeoning Pacific trade. The port, if it is to prosper, must modernize and enlarge its basic maritime facilities.

That’s the purpose of Proposition A.

Proposition A will make the Port of San Francisco truly and vigorously competitive. And it will not cost the taxpayers a penny.

Proposition A will authorize $42.5 million in revenue bonds for vital waterfront projects, including the conversion of Pier 80 into a modern, state-of-the-art container facility and the enlargement and modernization of cargo operations at Piers 94 and 96.

Additionally, Proposition A will provide funds for repairing the now deteriorating Jefferson Street Seawall and will match Federal dollars for construction of a much-needed breakwater to protect the City’s fishing fleet at Fisherman’s Wharf.

Proposition A also will finance the expansion of the passenger terminal at Pier 35.

Proposition A is a prudent investment in the City’s future. And these bonds are payable only from port revenues—your taxes will not be increased.

More ships, with more cargo and more passengers, mean more jobs and greater economic vitality for our city.

Proposition A will make our port, once again, a strong and lasting competitor for the commerce of the Pacific Basin. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco needs a good, working port. Vote yes on Proposition A and help bring it about.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
Port Revenue Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Citizens of San Francisco are worried about the deterioration of the port. Most of us can remember when the port was a thriving, bustling commercial enterprise, and the docks were maintained, clean, efficient, and busy.

But, the port has not adapted to container cargo and may be losing the few shipping lines that it now serves.

We must restructure the docks for active container shipping, and bring in railway lines to service the docks. We have one of the few deep water ports in America, an essential for modern shipping. LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT BEING ONE OF THE BEST PORTS IN THE WEST AGAIN!

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Wendy Nelder
President of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will permit the Port of San Francisco to issue bonds to finance needed construction and improvements. This would give the Port the same financing ability the Airport now has.

Through the issuance of revenue bonds, the Port would be able to undertake necessary improvements AT NO COST TO TAXPAYERS.

San Francisco deserves a modern, thriving port. Proposition A will help us build modern terminals, a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf which will help keep commercial fishermen in San Francisco, repair the seawall at Jefferson Street and expand our Passenger Terminal to handle increased cruise business that brings millions of dollars into our local economy.

Proposition A will give the Port of San Francisco the ability to make these kinds of improvements. Please join me in voting YES.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A offers San Franciscans the opportunity to direct the future of the Port of San Francisco. This measure will provide our Port with the key to the future.

We must keep pace with new developments, increase cargo and create new jobs. For every fifty new containers we move, 1.67 new jobs will be created.

This measure also includes funding for construction of the Fisherman's Wharf Breakwater, which is critically needed and long overdue.

Take part in the future of our Port. Join with me in voting YES on Proposition A.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a waterfront city. We have a superb natural harbor, which is also one of the few really deep water harbors—vital for modern deep water cargo ships.

We have used our badly deteriorating and long unimproved pier facilities to their maximum efficiency. But . . . times are changing. We must move NOW to keep pace with new developments, or risk enormous losses in cargo shipping, commercial fishing, and tourist trade.

It is ESSENTIAL that we adapt to container cargo that can be moved by train, truck, and ship.

Research has been done on what could give us the greatest increase in efficiency and profits for the very least amount of money. And the answer is: modernizing the South Terminal for adaptation to container cargo; providing rail access to the docks; protecting the commercial fishing fleet with a breakwater; and expanding passenger-handling facilities for cruise passenger tourists.

Prop A will provide these improvements RIGHT NOW. And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION
Arthur H. Coleman, President
James Rudden, Vice President
Gordon Lau, Member
Anne Halsted, Member
James Herman, Member
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<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Board (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT

Election Date ____________________________

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor enviéme la balota por correo:

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter's Initials ________

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente.

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE

Descripción del Impedimento/Incapacidad
Iniciales del Votante ________

FOR REGISTRAR’S USE ONLY

Prec. No. ________________
A.V. Prec. No. ____________
Ballot Type ________________
Affidavit No. ________________
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

_______ Date _________ Deputy Registrar
FROM:


DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M., TUESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1984
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO DE LA TARDE, MARTES, 30 DE OCTUBRE DE 1984, EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA ELECCION.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fisherman's Wharf is a valued segment of the community and needs your help to ensure its economic well-being.

A YES vote on Proposition A will provide the needed financing to build the long awaited breakwater to ensure the safety of our commercial fishing fleet, create new berths and new jobs.

A YES vote on Proposition A will repair the Jefferson Street Seawall before it becomes a dangerous hazard to our visitors and to our community.

A YES vote will insure the economic vitality of Fisherman's Wharf as well as the entire San Francisco Waterfront.

Join us and vote YES.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Louis Ferrari, President
Crab Boat Owner's Association

Christopher Martin
President, Fisherman's Wharf Merchant Assoc.

Fritz Arko
Alessandro Baccari
Ex. Secretary, Fisherman's Wharf Merchant Assoc.

L. B. Barnes
Fisherman's Wharf Seafood
Phil Bentivegna
Fishing Boat Butchie B
Bob Bugatto
California Shell Fish Co.
Ken Burger
Franciscan Restaurant
Pat Flanagan
Standard Fisheries
Anthony Casali
Fishing Boat Norene

Virgil P. Caselli, Native
S. Joseph Cincotta
F. Alioto Fish Co.
Nick D'Amato
Fishing Boat Nicky D
Nino Gerald
Tom Lazio
Tom Lazio Fish Co.
Andrew Lolli
William McDonnell
Albert Spadaro
Sports Fishing Boat
New Flories
Mario J. Alioto
Calif. Seafood Institute
Peter Brown
The Anchorage

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The opportunity is NOW!
Our Northern Waterfront is alive with activity—increase in passenger ships, thriving commercial developments.

Let us fuse that energy into our Southern Waterfront and take advantage of our natural deep water. That means newer, deeper draft merchant ships, increased cargoes and new jobs.

Missed opportunities cannot be recaptured. So act now! Don’t let this opportunity get away.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Sec/Treasurer San Francisco Labor Council
Le Roy King
Regional Director ILWU
Tim Twomey, President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trade Council
Chuck Mack, President
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our waterfront is an outstandingly beautiful and profitable aspect of San Francisco. The port has been badly neglected, however. We need to VOTE YES ON PROP A to improve and rebuild cargo and passenger facilities.

PROP A will guarantee increased maritime activities, new jobs, the revival of our fishing industry, and the safety of shoreline areas.

And ... AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!
For our neighborhood, and for our City, VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Phyllis Kern
Golden Gate Democratic Club* Open Space Committee*
Jim Wachob
District 8 Democratic Club*
Kevin Malone
District 8 Democratic Club*
Bette Landis
Democratic Women's Forum*
Rebecca Evans
Sierra Club*
Beverly Karnatz
Committee for Better Parks
and Recreation in Chinatown*

Richard Livingston
Adria Garabedian
Andrea Jepson
Madrid Hamilton
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Wallinda McCrea
Douglas Engmann
Dale Carlson
Stafford Buckley
Dick Pabich
Ron Huberman

*for identification purposes only

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

San Francisco has always been a great port city. And the San Francisco Port has always been a leading employer of minorities.

But the Port has sadly deteriorated. It has not kept up with modernizations and improvements. And what is even worse, it has not kept up with the competition. The Port MUST adapt to container cargo, and put in railway access to the docks. With your vote YES ON A, we can take advantage of our deep water harbor, attract more shipping trade, increase cargoes, and produce many more jobs.

And... AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!
VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Naomi Gray
Doris Thomas
Mabel Schine
Linda Dickens

J. E. Thomas
A. Brooks
Frankie Gillette
Lois DeCayette
Joel DeCayette
Jule Anderson
Altheda Carrie
George Newkirk
Elouise Westbrook
Shirley Jones
Clifton Jeffers
Joe Williams
Carol Belle
Benjamin James
Grandvel Jackson
Amos Brown
Faye Anderson
Zuretti Goosby
San Palomares-Criollos
Jene Rita Alviar
Ernest C. Ayala
Alan S. Wong
Stan Moy
Douglas S. Chan
Thomas Hsieh
Alicia Wang
Ben Tom
Pius Lee
Julie Tang
Louis Hop Lee
Dennis Wong
Melvin Dong Lee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our Port now needs $42 million to develop San Francisco’s maritime facilities to compete with ports such as Oakland, Seattle and San Diego.

These improved facilities are vital to San Francisco’s competition for jobs and trade for the Pacific. Currently all major west coast ports are building to meet the growing needs of America’s Pacific Trade. These ports have each spent an average of $57 million on recent container cargo expansion while San Francisco has spent nothing.

San Francisco must have at least comparable facilities in order to compete in this market. If the port is not developed for container cargo, San Francisco can forget about being a major port on the west coast as well as lose the jobs and revenue that a modern port could produce.

The Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that you vote to bring San Francisco the jobs and business that will be created by these revenue bonds. The bonds will be paid off from Port revenue and there is no taxpayer risk.

If you want to see the Port continue to grow and prosper vote yes on Proposition A.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reconstruct municipal harbor facilities!!!:

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

Juanita G. Raven
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committeeman
Bob Geary
Democratic County Committeeman
Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Martin Eng

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Port Revenue Bonds

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

When something is railroaded through City Hall on a “fast track”, it is always difficult not to join the stampede. This, however, is a bond issue in an amount larger than necessary to perform the actual work contemplated; not backed by written leases; and not backed even by “letter agreements” with corporations which supposedly will use Piers 80, 94 and 96 if improvements are made. This bond issue was rushed through the Board of Supervisors. Transmitted to the Board on July 24th, a scant six days later (on July 30th) and without a specific noticed public hearing, the Board voted 7-1 to place it on the ballot. I dissented because more time was needed for a proper analysis and public input.

Presently, the Port has a debt service requirement of approximately $104,000,000.00. This proposed revenue bond issue would increase the debt service requirement to $228,261,400.00; a staggering rise. The $42,500,000.00 bond issue would produce but $40,202,000.00 in net proceeds. The Port has a surplus of about $19,000,000.00, of which approximately $15,000,000.00 is available for capital projects. The Controller says $49,254,660.00, would thus be available for capital projects costing $41,610,000.00.

The Port is borrowing $7,644,660.00 more than is needed for these seven capital projects. Why? The Port admits it has no long-term written commitments for Piers 80, 94 and 96 which account for $37,570,000.00 of the total bond issue. How can we be assured that the bondholders will be repaid by revenues from those piers if there are no-long term commitments?

Moreover, the Port hasn’t even secured written “letter agreements” from corporations to assure that if those improvements are made, they will sign long-term commitments. Ironically, but $4,000,000.00 of the bond issue would be spent on needed improvements for Fisherman’s Wharf tenants, who generate almost 50% of net Port income, money which would be used to repay the money borrowed for Piers 80, 94 and 96. It’s like the tail wagging the dog.

Selling bonds is nothing more than borrowing money. Why borrow more money than you have to, and why borrow money for projects which don’t have long-term tenants? Be assured that even if this passes, I intend to persist in making Port officials answer those very questions.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

MOTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION A

MOTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A MEASURE AUTHORIZING THE PORT COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS TO FINANCE THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION OF CERTAIN PORT FACILITIES TO BE LOCATED AT THE PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby orders submitted to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 6, 1984 a measure authorizing the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to issue revenue bonds, all as set forth in the following measure, to wit:

Shall the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $42,500,000 the proceeds of which will be used to modernize container handling facilities and to upgrade various other maritime-oriented facilities at the Port of San Francisco’s piers 35, 80, 94 and 96 and at the Jefferson Street seawall, to construct a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, to construct an intermodal container transfer facility, to install a backflow prevention system at various locations, to replace various transformers and capacitors throughout the port, and to acquire, construct or renovate certain works, property or structures necessary or convenient for the operation of, and at, the Port of San Francisco, which facilities are operated by the Port Commission?

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

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

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Water Revenue Bonds

PROPOSITION B
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission operates the San Francisco Water Department. When the Commission needs funds to acquire, improve or develop Water Department facilities, it may issue revenue bonds to raise the funds. Before the Commission can issue revenue bonds, a majority of the voters must approve. The revenue bonds are then paid from Water Department revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds. Funds from the sale of the bonds would be used to acquire, improve or develop facilities necessary for the operation of the Water Department, including filtration plants and reservoirs. The bonds would be paid off from the revenues of the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance Water Department improvements.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Public Utilities Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

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

- Bond redemption: $104,000,000
- Bond interest: 169,260,000
- Total debt service requirement: 273,260,000

Based on a five year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning one year after the date of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $3,467,000 to a maximum of $14,022,000 annually for thirty-one years.

In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Water Department revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Water Department sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Water Department. Analysis of projected resources available to the Water Department indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on a resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The money from these bonds will be used to assure that drinking water we take from our Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs on the Peninsula is pure and meets all health standards. The bonds will be repaid from revenues of our Water Department. Not a penny will be charged on the property tax rolls or to the general taxpayers.

We have two huge lakes along side I-280 on the Peninsula, the Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs. About 15% of our drinking water in normal times comes from these lakes and others in Alameda County. For decades we used this water without filtration. Now, however, health officials tell us that all of the water from our Peninsula lakes must be filtered before it can be used. We now have a very limited filtering capacity which means that if, for any reason, our water supply from the Sierras was interrupted or reduced and we would need more local water, we would be unable to make full use of Crystal Springs water. There now is no filter plant at Crystal Springs. Whatever water we use from there must be pumped up to a small filtration plant at San Andreas before it can enter the system. This very severely limits the amount of drinking water we can draw from our nearest supply, and it is expensive. Passage of Proposition B would change all that.

By voting YES on B, you will provide for water system improvements including a new filtration plant right at Crystal Springs, for the expansion of the small plant at San Andreas, and for a necessary storage reservoir.

Your YES on B vote is an investment in the quality of our drinking water—an assurance that water from our nearest supply will be available to us pure, meeting all health requirements, when we need it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Generations ago, San Franciscans had the foresight to build one of the most magnificent water systems in the world—Hetch Hetchy, which brings water to San Francisco from the High Sierras.

Now, we must modernize the system to keep pace with higher standards of water quality.

Proposition B will authorize the San Francisco Water Department to issue $104 million in revenue bonds.

The money will be used to improve the system by expanding existing plants and by building additional filtration, treatment and holding facilities on Water Department properties on the Peninsula.

These facilities will provide safe drinking water for future generations of San Franciscans. Presently, if any of the existing facilities suffered a breakdown, the City could be forced to rely upon unfiltered water from Crystal Springs. The State Department of Public Health has directed the Water Department to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Our water is safe. It meets all state and Federal quality standards, and we want to keep it that way. Proposition B will assure low turbidity (silt content), reduce asbestos content, and prevent the spread of giardia lamblia, a virus not now found in our water system, but which could be brought in as watershed areas become more populated.

Proposition B, which will not have any effect on our tax structure, is a prudent investment, protecting our drinking water into the future. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote yes on Proposition B and help guarantee us pure, plentiful water.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION C
Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

YES 259
NO 260

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Department of Public Health operates the county hospitals, such as San Francisco General and Laguna Honda, and all other county public health services. The Department is run by a Public Health Director, who is appointed by the City's Chief Administrative Officer and who is responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would create a Health Commission, and place the Department of Public Health under the control of the Commission. The Commission would have seven members, appointed by the Mayor; no more than three members would be doctors, nurses, hospital administrators or other health care professionals. The Commission would appoint a Public Health Director, responsible to the Commission, to administer the Department. The Public Health Director could appoint and remove deputies to help administer the Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of a Health Commission appointed by the Mayor, and to be run by a Public Health Director, appointed by the Health Commission.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of the Chief Administrative Officer and to be run by a Public Health Director appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs of the Health Department, by approximately $8,400 per year."

The text of Proposition C appears on page 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Public Health Department has a budget of over $270 million and a staff of 5000, making it the largest agency in City government. Its responsibilities are many and far-reaching: San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital; emergency medical services; mental health services; sanitation; public health education; district health centers; inspection of public and private facilities. The list is long and growing.

In recent years, the list of problems facing departmental administrators has, unfortunately, also grown. Emergency Aid stations were closed. Ambulance service was drastically altered. Proposals to reorganize community mental health services were promoted and rejected, causing confusion for all. The AIDS crisis. The investigations at San Francisco General Hospital. And on and on.

Too often, these decisions and these issues were considered in a vacuum, without public input, without public debate, and without public scrutiny.

Why? In order to protect the Department of Public Health from the graft and corruption that plagued our City at the turn of the century, the Charter placed the department under the Chief Administrative Officer's auspices rather than a commission. Fifty years later, the department has outgrown this cumbersome arrangement. It is time to bring the administration of this important agency into the 20th Century, mirroring the management of other City departments.

Proposition C will establish a seven-member Health Commission, appointed by the Mayor, to set policy and supervise the Public Health Department. The commission will include both providers and consumers of health services. It will bring the Department more directly under the Mayor's control, allowing for more timely responses to issues and problems. Most importantly, it will ensure that the department is publicly accountable for its actions.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Public health policy has changed and the governance of our public health department must change too.

In the past few years the state and federal governments have shifted more and more of the responsibility for public health management to local governments.

Recent experience shows that our health department is not presently equipped to manage public health programs in the most effective manner.

Proposition C will streamline management—cutting two levels of bureaucracy while opening up our public health policy to the public itself.

I urge a "yes" vote on Proposition C.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Since 1971, the Department of Public Health has been plagued with problems and crises at its hospitals, clinics and emergency aid stations. Most recently, we again faced the threat of San Francisco General losing its accreditation. These many incidents are deeply disturbing, raising troubling questions in the public mind: Why do these problems persist? Why can't something be done about them once and for all?

In 1979, the national organization that accredits all hospitals reported that San Francisco General's "major problems . . . are related to the lack of an effective governing body free from the political decision-making process which results in delayed activity, inadequate funding, etc." Last January, the State auditors also cited the absence of "a governing body legally responsible for hospital governance" as a cause for "ineffective management."

No other hospital in California operates without a board of directors. Only one other department in San Francisco (Public Works) operates without a commission. Instead, San Francisco General and the Health Department are run by a bureaucracy, insulated from public accountability.

Proposition C establishes a commission for the Health Department, one that will hold public hearing, make public decisions, and be publicly accountable. Vote YES.

Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Supervisor Louise Renne

Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Doris Ward

Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

(Continued)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

San Francisco’s population is aging. In a few short years, a greater percentage of our citizens will be seniors—most living independently on fixed incomes, many frail and over 75—than those of other California cities. They will need nutritional information, home health care, and a broad range of coordinated social services.

The Department of Health, San Francisco General, Laguna Honda, the District Health Centers—these are critical providers of senior services. And as more and more state and federal programs are shifted to local agencies, the Department’s role and responsibilities will dramatically increase.

How will the Department respond to this increased responsibility? How can we ensure that it will develop policies and programs that meet seniors’ needs? And how can we be sure that these programs operate efficiently and effectively?

Proposition C is a big step in the right direction. VOTE YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is important for women.

Women provide the majority of services offered by the Health Department. Indeed public health is traditionally the domain of women and nurses. And while the many crises at General are too often blamed on nursing care, nurses virtually have no role in planning or organizing service delivery.

Women are also the major consumers of the Depart-ment’s services. As more and more block grants transfer health programs from the state and federal levels to local governments, the Department will become an increasingly important provider to women.

Proposition C gives women an opportunity to make their voices heard at the highest levels of the Health Department. And our voices must be heard if services are to be organized efficiently and responsibly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The policies governing San Francisco General affect every consumer and provider of health services in the City, yet there is little accountability to San Francisco taxpayers. No private hospital with General's size and influence operates without a board of trustees or directors. Indeed, no private organization of any kind with a $270 million annual budget—business, corporation, nonprofit foundation, whatever—operates without a governing board. Why does General?

As General bounces from one crisis to the next, with state and federal agencies threatening increasingly drastic actions, the weakness of the current management structure becomes clear to all. The Hospital and the Health Department need a commission, where public hearings can surface problems and issues in a timely fashion; where policies can be developed with the cooperation of private providers and consumers. The Health Commission will not be a watchdog meddling in day-to-day affairs, but an advocate for General, one providing continuity, stability and a rational decision-making process with regular rules and procedures.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Rolland Lowe, M.D.
Past President, San Francisco Medical Society
Robert Aaron, M.D.
Robert Gross, M.D.
Molly Coyer, M.D.
Robert Koshiyama, D.D.S.
Maureen Katz, M.D.
Yoshio Nakashima, D.D.S.

James Cole, M.D.
John Good, M.D.
Jeff Sandler, M.D.
Judy Keeven, M.D.
Robert Dickter, D.D.S.
Jeffrey Draisin, M.D.
Gabriel Escobar, M.D.
Brad Evans, M.D.

Lars Erickson, M.D.
Randy Yanda, M.D.
Stephen Collins, M.D.
Lewis Pepper, M.D.
Mark Smith, M.D.
Donald Goldmacher, M.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is obligated to ensure that all San Francisco communities have access to medical services. The AIDS crisis brought the health care needs of gay men to the forefront of public discussion. It brought home the importance of a Department flexible and responsive to quickly emerging problems and epidemics, one capable of quickly reallocating resources to dire community needs.

The general health needs of gay men and women, however, are largely unrecognized. The Health Commission will give our community the voice it needs in the health planning processes. It will ensure that the diversity of our City is represented in the consideration of these important issues.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli
John Mehring
Del Martin
Donald Cataland
Cleave Jones
Randy Stallings

Ron Huberman
Richard Allman
Jeff Jones
Phyllis Lyon
Debra Friedland
Roberto Esteves

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Hispanics in San Francisco strongly support Proposition C, the Health Commission Charter Amendment.

Health is vital to the Latino Community of San Francisco. We are a younger population, with larger families and with special health needs, such as those of Central American refugees. In recent years, federal and state funding for health programs has decreased, leaving community health programs in a difficult financial situation. Recent changes in Medically Indigent Adult services have also negatively impacted our community.

In addition, the need for better and expanded bilingual medical services continues to be a top priority in San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition C.

Celso Ortiz
Rafael Cedillos
Maria Degado
Roberto Hernandez
Joanna Devito-Larson
Rosa Maria Clos
Susan Houston
Arnell Rodrigues
P. Braverman, M.D.
Alfredo Rodrigues
Sonia Melara
Joseph Tanner
Edgar Quiroz
Angel Courteras

Roger Hernandez
Tom Romero
Raphael Taliaferro
Juanita DelCarlo
Juan Pifarre
Rudolph Mathias
Rolph Hurtado
Alfredo Rivas
Vilma Mondova
O. Bracker
Ray Rivera
Lorenzo Dill
Yolanda Cameros
Monica Asturias

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The chief opposition to Proposition C comes from two sources: The Chief Administrative Officer and the officials of the University of California Medical Center.

The CAO's opposition is understandable. He simply doesn't want to lose control of the Health Department and SF General.

UC's opposition is more puzzling, until you realize that it receives $10-15 million from the City each year for staffing at General Hospital without a publicly reviewed contract! Why is UC afraid of having its relationship with General publicly scrutinized by a Health Commission?

Let's clear the air. Vote YES on Proposition C.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

We support Proposition C.

Fred Ross
James O'Connor
Dale Carlson
Pamela Duffy
Gerald Yoachum
D.J. Sovero
Rosalind Wolf
Gordon Brownell
Jim Wachob
Steven Krefting
JoAnne Miller
Maura Kealey
Margaret O'Driscoll
Nicceria Reveeto

Beatrice Patterson
Arlo Hale Smith
Dian Blomquist
Thomas Moore
Peter Hanson
Jack Morrison
Mary Vail
Sally Osaki
Linda Post
Terrance Farr
Ken McEldowney
Sue Hestor
Willie Gee, D.D.S.
Agar Jaicks
John Holzclaw

Paul Vacaralli
Al Cassiato
Alan Raznick
James Haas
Al Borvice
Essie Webb
Joan Moulton
Russell Zellers
Stanley Shields
Richard Sevilla
Ann Daley
Dorothy Labudde
Dorice Murphy
Howard Strassner
Mark Davalos
Larry Griffin

Jay Wallace
Rob Waters
Kevin Malone
Jan Holloway
Norman Rolfe
Tom Jones
Barbara Halliday
Sandra Powell
Deborah Sarvis
Esther Marks
James Augustino
Sharon Johnson
Eileen Adams
Ruth Gravanis
Michael Heffer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Community clinics provide thousands of San Franciscans with access to essential primary health care and preventive health services. Yet, these community-based institutions, as well as the neighborhoods and people they represent, have been excluded from participation in health policy decision-making in San Francisco. Excluded, too, is any public debate on alternatives to hospital-based health delivery and financing systems that could prove cost-effective and could better serve the people of San Francisco.

Proposition C, The Health Commission Charter Amendment, offers a forum for public discussion of local health policy issues. By giving the neighborhoods and communities input into health policy decisions, the Health Commission will enable San Franciscans to create a new community of interest and new community of action in the area of health service delivery.

VOTE YES on PROPOSITION C.

San Francisco Community Clinic Consortium

Myles Dixon
George Dykstra
Susan Ehrlich
Patricia Franks
Debra Friedland
Kate Lambert

Mike Pincus
David Smith, M.D.
Marin Waukazo
Jerome West
Sophie Wong
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Commission will be of vital importance to the Asian community. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Dr. Yoshio Nakashima
Louis Hop Lee
Samuel Chung

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is a key source of medical services in the black community, both directly through General Hospital and the district health centers, and indirectly through community and mental health clinics.

But our special problems—an infant mortality rate significantly above rates in other Bay Area counties, for example—are not often heard by the Department’s policy-makers, for they are insulated and isolated from our community.

Our concerns must be heard if they are to be ad-
dressed. Proposition C gives us a platform from which to speak. Vote YES.

Elouise Westbrook
Yvonne Golden
Lorenzo R. Dill
Zaretti L. Goosby, D.D.S
Julianne Malveaux
Eugene Coleman
Naomi T. Gray

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This proposal to put politics into the Department of Public Health by creating a “commission” to direct it is an example of the misguided philosophy of attacking governmental problems by throwing bureaucracy at them. It should be soundly defeated. Currently, the City’s health officials report to one person, the Chief Administrative Officer, who can respond swiftly to any crisis and set consistent policy. The responsibility for the Department lies with the CAO, not a group of political appointees. When our Charter was adopted in 1932, the freeholders explained the rationale of giving the CAO management responsibility over the Health Department. The idea was “to provide reasonable safeguards AGAINST POLITICAL MANIPULATION.” (Emphasis added) Their report stated the office of CAO was designed to be “protected from political influence as largely as possible . . . ” and “it is intended that this officer shall be entirely independent in discharging the function of the office, and particularly, to be free from interference of the mayor, because the latter is subjected to political influence.” Although the Charter was adopted in 1932, its logic still makes powerful sense. Besides blurring lines of responsibility, this iniquitous proposal contradicts health management practices in California and the United States. In fact, the same idea was evaluated in 1971 by a committee established by the supervisors, which concluded that the commission concept, a “seemingly attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another bureaucratic layer in an already cluttered city administrative structure.” To paraphrase The Progress, the Muni is the best proof that “the presence of a commission does not guarantee good management.” Vote NO on Proposition C.

Supervisor 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.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The enactment of Proposition C would set the clock back on health care delivery in San Francisco to the 1920s. As proposed, the measure would almost exactly duplicate the system of Health Care abandoned by the City in 1932 because it had become corrupt, politicized and incapable of effectively responding to the growing challenges of modern health care administration.

In 1973 the Board of Supervisors itself considered and rejected a similar Health Commission option. The board's reason was that commissions do not make effective management tools. "The Commission, seemingly an attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another layer in an already cluttered City administrative structure."

The commission concept also goes counter to sound health management practices. Earlier this year, a team of top Bay Area health care professionals was asked to identify the leading municipal hospitals in the country. None of the institutions identified uses a commission form of administration largely because commissions, while perhaps capable of overseeing some urban systems such as mass transit, have proven ineffective and cumbersome.

The argument has been advanced that a commission would allow for greater citizen input into the health department. The fact is that the Department of Health already has some 440 individuals serving on 27 Citizen Advisory Committees—more than with any other city department. The proposed seven member commission would be insufficient in both size and technical competence to do other than deal with the health care in San Francisco on a "crisis-to-crisis" basis.

As we move into the 21st Century, the administration of San Francisco's health care systems will only become more challenging. A form of governance that proved inadequate 50 years ago and was rejected by the Board of Supervisors eleven years ago as inappropriate, is not the best way to provide for our city's health care needs of the future. We urge you to vote "No" on Proposition C.

Dr. Frank Lewis, Chief of Staff, San Francisco General Hospital
Walter Newman, Overseer, UCSF
Yori Wada, UC Board of Regents
Dr. Frank Curry, Former Director of Public Health
Dr. Frank Sooy, Chancellor Emeritus, UCSF
Virginia Leishman, Director of Nursing, Laguna Honda Hospital

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

A vote for Proposition C is a vote to politicize health care in San Francisco. The authors of the 1932 City Charter foresaw this when they abolished the city's highly politicized seven member health commission and placed the Department of Health under the jurisdiction of the Chief Administrative Officer. Proposition C would return San Francisco to the pre-1932 system of politicized health care management.

In writing the 1932 Charter, the authors recognized the need to balance executive authority by splitting it between the Mayor and the CAO. Departments, such as health, which were thought to be best managed if protected from direct political influence, were placed under the jurisdiction of the CAO, who is appointed for a fixed 10 year term to remove the office from political pressure.

Despite the occurrence of problems the system has worked well. San Francisco General has perhaps the best Trauma Unit in the country. The hospital's AIDS unit is unquestionably the best and most humane in the nation.

Moving control of the city's health care budget from the Chief Administrative Officer to the Executive will create a "strong mayor" type of government which the Charter was designed to prevent. Health commissioners would necessarily be beholden to the political factions or individuals which lobbied for their appointment and to the mayor who appoints them.

There are alternatives to a Health Commission. Several have already been recommended by a blue ribbon panel of health management experts appointed following the report on General Hospital. We believe these recommendations and perhaps others, including a variation on the health commission concept, deserve further study.

Proposition C would bring about a radical restructuring of government and health care delivery in San Francisco. Both issues are far too important to be decided hastily. We urge a No vote on Proposition C.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, President, Board of Supervisors
Florette White Pomeroy, Consultant
William K. Coblenz, Attorney
Thomas E. Horn, VP, Board of Trustees, War Memorial

J. Gary Shansby, Chairman of the Board, Shaklee Corporation
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission

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

I oppose Proposition C because:
1. It puts the Health Department under the control of politically appointed non-professionals. I cannot agree that this should be done. It brings in politics and throws out expertise.
2. It adds an extra layer of bureaucracy making government more expensive and management more difficult.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Your City Hall representatives would have you believe that by replacing our present Health System with a Health Commission, composed of seven members, at a recompense of $100 per month, will improve the services.

Hogwash. Just another layer of government.

With a budget of $270 millions, 5000 employees would you put your faith in the hands of seven and still maintain the same Health Director?

What we need is a clean sweep of the present management; new faces; new ideas. The Charter provides for this, let’s do it—“Now,” not later.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION C

Marguerite A. Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

By creating a health commission for the Public Health Department, the city of San Francisco would create more problems rather than solve them.

Past experience has indicated a need to separate politics from health care. San Francisco would be turning the clock back to a situation in the 1920s when the city had a seven member commission appointed by the Mayor that oversaw the management of the Public Health Department. The delivery of effective health care was seriously compromised by the politicized department which was a direct consequence of the department’s health commission.

For this reason, the citizens of San Francisco at that time passed a charter reform that removed the Health Department from the politically appointed commission and placed it in a newly created Chief Administrative Officer who would be secured against political pressures.

The creation of the Health Commission would take 40% of the budget of the Chief Administrative Officer’s budget and place it under the control of a politically appointed Commission, thus negating the intent of the Chief Administrative Officer’s Department which was created to administer departments that should be removed from political concerns.

Do not politicize San Francisco’s health care. Vote No on Proposition C.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, Public Health, and County Agricultural Department; Health Advisory Board; Coroner’s Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the (Continued on page 82)

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

PROPOSITION D
Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?  

YES 261
NO 262

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement Board has complete authority to invest the funds of the Retirement System for city employees. The Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would remove the requirement that the Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California. Instead, the proposition would require the Retirement Board to make investments with the care and skill that a prudent person would make under similar circumstances.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the way the Retirement Board invests pension money. Instead of making only those investments which are legal for insurance companies, the Board would be able to make any investments that a prudent person would make.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Retirement Board to keep making only the same kind of investments which are legal for insurance companies.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-5 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.


Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, increase the cost of government. However, as a result of its authorizing additional flexibility for investments, earnings may be higher or lower than what could have occurred absent this amendment.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 63.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote YES on Proposition D.
The purpose of Proposition D is to clarify the investment responsibility of the Retirement Board and to add language expressly to comply with the recently enacted State Constitutional amendment on fiduciary standards for public pension plans (Proposition 21, June 1984).
Since 1932, the charter has referred to the Insurance Code as the guideline for pension investments.
Insurance Code investment requirements are unsuitable to current pension fund investment practices and severely restrict the ability of the Retirement Board to manage the fund to achieve the best possible investment return for the City and County of San Francisco and the members of the Retirement System.
The added new language will establish firm guidelines for the Retirement Board to discharge its responsibility as the fiduciary for the Retirement Fund. This new language will also serve as increased protection for members of the Retirement System by applying recognized fiduciary standards for which there is considerable statutory and case law.
In summary, the proposed charter amendment serve a dual purpose: it removes obsolete and ambiguous language and brings the Retirement System into compliance with the State Constitution. Both changes will enhance and improve the System’s investment capabilities and the ability to achieve its goals and objectives.
Proposition D is endorsed and supported by the Retirement Board and the Board of Supervisors.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This is a worthwhile Charter amendment which updates obsolete and ambiguous provisions on how the Retirement Board can invest funds. It institutes standards consistent with a recent voter-approved amendment to the California Constitution. Investment practices have been refined dramatically in the past 50 years, and income and appreciation choices have increased tremendously. The investment professionals working for the Retirement System now are prevented from making the very most prudent investments possible, and City employees and taxpayers are, thus, prejudiced and hurt.

Present investment rules are based upon the State Insurance Code, which contravenes contemporary investment practices. Proposition D will give more latitude in making high-return investments, but will also retain vigorous guidelines on investment of Retirement System funds while increasing the protection of City employees. It will save money for taxpayers by enabling a better return on Retirement System assets. It’s logical. That’s why I recommend a “yes” vote.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties
The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive, and may continue to receive, benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established. Provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies in California.

The retirement board shall discharge its duties with respect to the system with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with these matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like aims.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name _____________________________________________

Address _____________________________________________ Apt. # ______

Telephone No. (required) _______________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

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

Second choice locations (if any) ____________________________________

Signature _______________________________________________
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?  

YES 264

NO 265

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would provide that the City contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for a least one year prior to the employee’s death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the health care fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Bill Maher.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs and present membership data of the Health Service System, in excess of $990,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 67.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This charter amendment calls for extending a limited measure of aid from the City and County of San Francisco for the health care of the surviving spouse of an active or retired City employee. Proposition E will allow the City and County to continue paying its share into the health care system and not force the surviving spouse and eligible family dependents to assume the entire financial burden for health care payments.

Under existing statute, the City and County and its employees, active or retired, share the cost of health care for the employee, their spouse and children. However, upon the death of the employee, the City and County's share of payments to the health care system stops.

Thus, the surviving spouse is compelled to pick up the entire cost for the health care plan while struggling to survive on a reduced family income and, at the same time, contend with ever increasing medical/hospital expenses and everyday living costs for themselves and eligible family dependents.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Justice tempered with compassion. VOTE YES. Surviving spouses of City workers receive an automatic 50% cut in retirement pay upon the death of their partners. Why further burden this small group by withdrawing subsidy for health care?

The Retirement System actuary has officially confirmed that the average pension check for this group is $300.00 per month; incidentally, below the nationally quoted poverty level.

Submitted by William T. Reed, Chairman Legislative Committee, Retired Employees
City & County of San Francisco
Helen McAtee, Chairperson
Philip Kearney, President, and retired manager of the Health Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Health Service Board which administers the health benefits provided to active and retired employees and their dependents fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the surviving spouse upon the death of a retired employee.

This financial problem is especially acute because a surviving spouse's pension is cut by 50% at the death of the employee and because of the high cost of medical insurance. Medical cost increases have outpaced general inflation rates over the last three (3) years by about two to one.

We urge your "YES" vote on Proposition "E" on the basis of need and equity.

Abraham Bernstein, M.D., President
Health Service Board of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Surviving spouses of city employees need this for a relatively comfortable widowhood. Let's extend a small measure of consideration to those who are left on their own.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Proposition E if approved would require the city to subsidize the health premiums of the surviving spouses of non-uniformed city employees. The cost to the city would amount to $900,000 per year and give city employees a benefit that is not normally enjoyed by workers in private industry.

The majority of private employees have health plans that allow surviving spouses to be members of such plans but the employer does not subsidize the premiums of these survivors in anyway. Being permitted to join a group plan that provides comprehensive coverage at a reasonable rate is a sufficient benefit in and of itself.

If this amendment is approved it will violate the spirit of the Charter provision that sets city employee salaries and benefits at the average of that which prevails in the metropolitan Bay Area. We believe in fair treatment and compensation for city employees and our current rules provide exactly that.

Vote No on Proposition E.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by struckout type.

8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

The city and county, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service system fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the health care to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the health care to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members’ dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons’ dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1973, shall be effective July 1, 1973, 1984.
Employee Death Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?

YES 267

NO 268

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, who is a member of the Retirement System is entitled to a death benefit of six months salary if he or she dies, regardless of cause, before retirement. The benefit is paid to the employee's estate or designated beneficiary.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would provide that if an officer or employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, is injured through external and violent means in the course of employment and the employee dies within 180 days of the injury, an additional benefit of 12 months salary would be paid to the employee's estate or designated beneficiary.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to pay an additional benefit of 12 months salary to a city employee who dies from an injury caused by external and violent means in the course of employment.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to provide an additional death benefit to these city employees who die from external and violent means in the course of employment.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the number of employees and their respective salary rates which qualify for payment under the provisions of this proposed amendment. Based on experience to date, the cost of this additional amount should not be substantial.”
Employee Death Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F provides a small compensation for the survivor of a city employee (non Police or Fire) killed in the line of duty. Let’s agree to this minor expenditure for the survivors of those who have died in city service.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.
Only rarely is a city employee killed in the line of duty, but death can come with fierce suddenness.

Two Muni workers were crushed by cable car machinery in 1978; the following year, two Water Department employees were murdered at the Lake Merced Pumping Station; and in March 1981, a Hetch Hetchy lineman fell to his death.

For the families of the vast majority of city workers, there is little protection when death comes. Police officers and fire fighters already have special death benefits.

Proposition F would cover all other workers in the City Retirement System. Proposition F will afford some measure of protection to city workers killed in the performance of their duties.

Proposition F will provide to beneficiaries an additional full year salary to the half-year presently provided, for a total of 18 months.

This is a small amount for a life given in the service of our city. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.
Proposition F is designed to correct a serious inequity on behalf of miscellaneous members of the Retirement System who are killed in line of duty or who die as a result of a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury.

Under current charter provisions, a designated beneficiary of a member who dies in the course of employment from any cause receives the member’s contributions to the system, plus six months’ salary. Proposition F focuses only on those members who are killed in the line of duty or who die within 180 days from a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury. Beneficiaries of such members will be accorded an additional insurance benefit of twelve months’ salary.

The payment of additional compensation to a designated beneficiary will be subject to the independent hearing officer process as set forth in the City charter.

Proposition F is fair and equitable and, based on actuarial projections, the cost is minimal.

Proposition F is sponsored and endorsed by the Retirement Board, unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, and strongly supported by Mayor Dianne Feinstein.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

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

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

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

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

(Continued on page 84)
Police Probationary Period

PROPOSITION G

Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?

YES 270
NO 271

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers entering the Police Department serve a one-year probationary period. During the first 32 weeks, the police officer goes through the police training program. After successfully completing training, the officer is then assigned to regular police duties. The Police Department has 20 weeks to evaluate the officer while on regular police duty. After this 20 week period, the probation is complete.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would extend the probationary period of the police officer to one year after the completion of the training. In no event would it extend the probationary period beyond 84 weeks from the date of entry. Any termination for breach of duty or misconduct would require charges and a hearing before the Police Commission.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the probationary period for a police officer to be extended to one year after completing the police training course but not to exceed 84 weeks.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the probationary period for a police officer to remain one year after the date of entry into the department.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Your YES vote for this amendment will enable the Police Department to provide more effective police services by ensuring that after officers graduate from the Academy and complete a field training program, an adequate probationary evaluation period exists to determine an officer's fitness to perform police duties. Society demands much from its police officers. As the nature of police work has become increasingly complex, training and performance evaluation functions must meet the needs of an ever-evolving profession.

Great expenditure of time and money are invested in training police officers. Presently, if a recruit is not deemed ready for duty, the probationary period can be completed during any retraining, thus making it difficult and costly to determine ultimate fitness for duty.

By voting YES, you will give the Chief of Police time necessary to adequately train and evaluate an officer's performance and to better ensure quality police services.

The Police Department has met and conferred with the Police Officers' Association regarding this amendment and has obtained that organization's support for its passage.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Police Chief asked for a longer probationary period because it is needed. Vote yes.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition G.

In recent years, because San Francisco has had the financial strength to do so, we've steadily expanded the size of the Police Department.

It is now the largest ever, with 1987 officers.

More and more officers are being assigned to our neighborhoods on beats and in patrolcars. We want the best officers possible.

That's why Proposition G is so important. It will give the Department greater ability to screen out officers who do not measure up to the strict standards of professionalism this city demands.

Proposition G will extend the probation period for a new officer to one complete year following completion of his or her field training.

Presently, probation starts when an officer is first inducted into the Department, before 18 weeks of class work in the City's outstanding Police Academy and another 14 weeks of field training.

As strenuous as the class work and the training may be, the real test of an officer is on the street.

That's where his or her coolness, competence and compassion—in fact, all the qualities that this city wants in a superior police department—can be observed and tested.

Proposition G will give the department a full year to evaluate an officer in uniform and on the job.

Those who don't measure up can be dismissed after a departmental hearing. Protected will be the City's rightful concern that our police officers can truly be described as the City's finest.

Proposition G is a common-sense measure, sought by the Chief of Police, that will strengthen the San Francisco Police Department. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This is probably the most important proposition on this Fall's ballot, a common sense measure. It deals with the Police Department, which has the ultimate responsibility for the protection of persons and property in our community. It increases the probationary period of police officers by one year. It is intended to ensure that the men and women who protect us are of the highest quality possible. Right now, police officers actually have only a four month probationary period. That's because they spend over 12 months probation in class and training, and only four months on the streets and on the job.

Police commanders need more time to evaluate the recruits' "street" performance. Proposition G does that by extending the on-the-job probationary period up to one year. For the sake of our children, neighbors and all San Franciscans, I want to be sure that a police officer is fully competent from a practical standpoint, not merely because of a classroom perspective. Therefore, I support Proposition G, and I urge you to vote for it, too.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Police Motorcycle Pay

PROPOSITION H

Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?

YES 274
NO 275

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and who are assigned to the Traffic Division get bonus pay. Police officers who ride motorcycles as part of their job, but who are assigned to duties other than traffic, do not get bonus pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would give all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job to get the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want only those San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and are assigned to the Traffic Division to get bonus pay.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted "No."

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current rates of pay, staffing and assignments by the police department, the cost of government would be increased by approximately $74,000 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Honda Motorcycle Unit of the San Francisco Police Department has, because of antiquated charter language, been denied payment of the hazard pay which is currently given the two-wheel motorcycle officers in the Traffic Division.

Because the primary function of the Honda Motorcycle Unit is crime fighting and not traffic enforcement, the word “traffic” must be deleted from the charter in order to compensate equally all officers who perform hazardous motorcycle duty.

Please join us in voting YES for this very fair charter amendment.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

In 1970, the San Francisco Police Department created a unit of lightweight motorcycles to patrol Golden Gate Park and the beaches surrounding the City. In 1977 these duties were drastically changed to counteract rising street crimes around the Western Addition. Neighborhood associations, seeing the effectiveness of the unit, also requested additional patrols by these motorcycle officers. Since 1977 the Honda Unit (as it is known now) has been assigned to virtually every neighborhood in the City to reduce purse snatches, “red light” robberies, drag racing, and street narcotics traffic, along with demonstrations, marches, parades, and sporting events all over the City.

Also occurring since 1977 have been injuries to these highly visible, highly vulnerable motorcycle officers. Some of these injuries include one officer hit on the head, and another officer suffering a leg broken by an auto which ran a red light. There have been numerous officers struck by other vehicles causing injuries, and injuries due to other road hazards (oil slicks, pothole etc.). These have increased sharply since the Honda Unit has been assigned to primarily street patrol. One officer was shot twice while patrolling the Western Addition for purse snatches.

It is obvious that these officers are no longer “just” patrolling the parks and beaches as they were initially intended, but are now assigned to patrol the streets of the most crime-ridden areas of the City combating street crimes and enforcing traffic laws. These officers on prior occasions have requested Motorcycle Hazard Pay (which traffic enforcement two-wheel motorcycle officers already receive) for their patrol of these neighborhoods and streets on the two-wheel motorcycles but have been denied because of outdated wording in the Charter. Passage of this amendment would correct this inequity.

Al Casciiato
President, S.F.P.O.A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

All police officers who ride motorcycles in the course of duty face special danger and deserve the premium pay already allowed for motorcycle traffic officers.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

A police officer on a two-wheeler is often the first on the scene of a major crime or emergency. Day after day, there is no more hazardous duty for our police.

Whether on a motorcycle in pursuit of a felon on city streets, or on a motorbike on patrol in the remote areas of the City’s parklands, an officer lives with danger. Because they can cut through traffic, the two-wheelers often are first to arrive at a shooting or bank robbery or car crash.

The City Charter has long recognized the dangers inherent in this essential police work and has provided hazard-pay for motorcycle officers of the Traffic Division. Proposition H simply extends hazard-pay to the 17 or so officers on the equally-perilous motorbike detail.

The amount of money involved is small—only $178 a month for each officer. Proposition H is small recognition of the dangers the police daily face in the line of duty. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?

YES 278

NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco does not have an official position on whether federal taxes should be used for certain kinds of defense spending.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I says the Board of Supervisors must inform the President and certain other federal officials that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether they want their tax dollars used for certain kinds of “excessive military expenditures”, as defined in the measure. Proposition I also says the City’s Chief Administrative Officer must publish an annual report on the amount of federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents, what portion of these taxes are used for military spending, and what portion are used for social or human needs. The Board of Supervisors would appoint a seven-member Citizens’ Advisory Committee to oversee the preparation of the report.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you think federal officials should be told that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending. You also want the City to publish an annual report on how federal tax dollars collected from San Francisco residents are spent.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t think taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending, and you don’t want the City to publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time but should not be substantial.”

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 75.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This initiative should be passed because it educates people about excessive military spending and sends a clear message to the Federal Government that people want a choice as to how their taxes are spent.

Homer Hobi
Chairperson
The Humanist Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why waste taxpayers' money for a handful of misguided individuals?
City government is mandated to govern local citizens affairs.

Martin Eng
School Board Candidate

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

Proposition I

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

Section 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following terms are defined:
(a) Excessive military expenditures: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is destined for research, development, and production of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons; research, development, and production of outer space laser-beam technology weapons (popularly known as “star-war” weapons); research, development, and production of chemical and biological warfare; military aid, both overt and covert, to undemocratic and/or repressive governments (governments that violate the basic human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948 by the United Nations).
(b) Social or human needs: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is used for education, housing, health and human services, public transportation, and the arts.
(c) San Francisco taxpayer: any individual who pays federal taxes and who reports his or her principal place of residence within the San Francisco city limits; and any corporation who is considered by the Internal Revenue Service as residing in San Francisco.
(d) portion of revenues in 3(a) budgeted for social or human needs;
(e) average individual tax contribution;
(f) average individual tax contribution allocated to (1) excessive military expenditures and (2) social needs.

The Board of Supervisors shall appoint a Citizen's Advisory Committee every year to oversee the preparation of the report and to ensure that its findings are accurate and impartial. The Citizen's Advisory Committee shall consist of seven members, at least three of whom shall be volunteers from renowned Peace organizations in San Francisco.

The report shall use the most current figures available from the federal government at the time of publication, citing the sources for the computations. If the necessary tax and budgetary breakdowns for San Francisco were not available, the report shall base itself upon tax revenue and budgetary figures for the entire nation (or subdivision thereof) and produce accurate extrapolations.

The Chief Administrative Officer shall publish the report in the two newspapers of largest circulation in San Francisco, no earlier than 14 days before but no later than the normal deadline for the filing of federal income taxes for individuals.
PROPOSITION J

(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco has no policy about the investment of pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco and its agencies not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa. This would be the official policy until Black people are given full political and civil rights by the government of South Africa.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want it to be the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City and County of San Francisco to have an official policy against investing pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

How "J" Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition on South African investment policy had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Julianne Malveaux, the official proponent of the petition drive, had gathered 11,404 signatures which she turned in to the Registrar on August 8.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,520 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

"Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, investment income may be affected in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We support removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa because we believe the city of San Francisco should not support the reprehensible institution of apartheid. Non-whites in South Africa are denied freedom of association, freedom of mobility, freedom of speech, and voting rights. San Franciscans support this inequality when city pension funds are invested in companies that do business with South Africa.

This investment is also a very risky investment since any civil unrest in South Africa may lower the value of the investment. Other investment possibilities will equal or exceed current yields on the pension portfolio.

We support this initiative because we support equal rights for all, and because we believe in prudent investment of city pension funds.

San Franciscans for Responsible Investments
Julianne Malveaux, Chair
Essie Mornen, Co-Chair
Henry Clark, Co-Chair
Arlo Hale Smith, Treasurer

Hon. Sala Burton
Hon. Harry Britt
Hon. Doris Ward
Hon. Richard Hongisto
Hon. Nancy Walker
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Louis Hopp Lee
Kim Corsaro
Roberto Hernandez
Bruce St. Cyr
Tim Lennon
Beatrice Eisman
Joan Apodaca
Wardell Jackson
Susan Englander
Henry Der
Sue Hestor
Ida Strickland
Bradford Paul
Daniel Moses
National Labor Relations
Board Union Local 20

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

By supporting Proposition J, San Franciscans join citizens from fourteen other cities, including Washington, D.C., Boston, and Berkeley, in removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa. Our support strikes a blow against the apartheid policy that has denied Black and non-white people equal rights in South Africa.

Removing pension funds from South Africa makes good economic sense. International investment advisors recommend against such investment because of the frailty of the South African political situation. Significantly, none of the cities that have divested funds from South Africa have had lower earnings since divestment.

It is both morally just and fiscally sound to vote YES for Proposition J!

Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Economics
S.F. State University
Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud that we were the first state in the nation to vote to sell from our public pension fund portfolio all investments in firms doing business in South Africa. Since the passage of this landmark legislation, it has been our experience that divestiture makes not only a strong moral statement against apartheid, but divestiture has proven to have had no negative impact on our pension earnings.

I urge San Franciscans to give serious consideration to both the moral and the financial arguments as you consider divestiture as a policy of your great city.

Michael Dukakis
Governor, Massachusetts
Submitted by John Burke

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

For over a decade individuals and institutional investors, including local and state governments, universities, foundations, churches, Taft-Hartley pension funds and health and welfare plans have refused to invest in, and divested from corporations and financial institutions economically supporting apartheid in South Africa.

They are investing and earning competitive returns in housing, small business, alternative energy, and other socially productive investments which create employment and prevent capital from being exported to South Africa.

It is fiduciarily irresponsible to risk beneficiaries' pension assets by investing in companies in South Africa.

Many trade and corporate risk analysts have recommended no investment exposure in South Africa. The Rockefeller Study Commission on U.S. policy toward Southern Africa, recently recommended no new corporate investments in that white, minority ruled country.

Vote to create jobs, housing and small business in your community, not apartheid in South Africa. Vote YES on Proposition J.

John Harrington, President
Working Assets Money Fund

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

"For the sake of the children of all South Africans, black and white, for God's sake, for the sake of world peace, the international community must take action, it must exert pressure on South Africa—political pressure, diplomatic pressure and above all, economic pressure." (Bishop Desmond Tutu, General Secretary-South African Council of Churches, 1981)

The apartheid system continues because of Western support. The South African Council of Churches has said "foreign investors must know they are investing to buttress one of the most vicious systems since Nazism." As members of the international religious community, we can no longer let others make decisions which contradict all that we believe in. We urge San Franciscans to vote yes on Proposition J as a specific, responsible way to express their moral rejection of apartheid.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I support Proposition J and encourage a statewide effort to remove pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON "J"

STATEMENT BY UNION OFFICIALS

The United Nations General Assembly declared South African apartheid "a crime against humanity"; and that investment in South Africa "encourages the apartheid policies of that country".

Representatives of several hundred million unionists, meeting under UN -ILO auspices, called for the elimination of stocks of companies investing in South Africa, from pension funds.

As unionists and human rights advocates we support this measure.

Committee for International Support of Trade Union Rights
Charles Lamb
Anthony L. Ramos
Jack Goldberger
Curtis Mc Clain
Frank Souza
Stanley M. Smith
Mary Anne Petersen
Timothy J. Twomey
Walter L. Johnson
Jack Henning
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

To protect American interests and to halt the spread of Communist influence into South Africa, responsible action is needed to end legally-required racial segregation and to reasonably extend voting rights. Proposition J is an important step towards a moderate solution of the South African problem.

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman

Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Todd Roust
Republican State Senate Nominee
Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

WARNING TO VOTERS

Disregard any self-serving statements by Peter Ashe, Meta Stanley, and their controversial Retirement Board in connection with Proposition J. The Retirement Board has done more than just aid South Africa by its investment policies. The Retirement Board has made serious investment errors, produced poor investment yields, and run up market value investment portfolio losses of $160,852,320 (as of 3/30/84) with Prudential-Bache.

One Retirement Board “success” was the purchase of 10,000 shares of Citicorp for $3,473,320. The shares on 3/30/84 were worth $340,000 (90% loss).

Mike Garza
Robert Silvestri
Max Woods

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Rainbow Coalition and all members, support this initiative. Stop investments of San Francisco pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. Support Human Rights. People have a right to know that their pension funds are being used to support a racist, repressive, apartheid system, that denies basic human and civil rights to 24 million Africans. We have a right to know that a Black man can be detained in the South African penal system for as long as two years, for not having identification. That Black people there are denied the right to vote, buy or sell land, and the right to live or work where they choose. Support Human Rights. Vote in favor of prop. J.

Gale White
African American of the Rainbow
Rev. Howard Gloyd
Northern California Chairman
The Rainbow Coalition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco CISPES supports the removal of city pension fund investments from firms that profit from apartheid.

The government of South Africa, like the government of El Salvador, denies its people the most basic human rights: freedom from arbitrary arrest and torture; freedom of speech and association; and the right to a decent standard of living.

In 1983, San Franciscans said no to military aid to El Salvador. In 1984, let us say no to investments in South Africa.

San Francisco Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Apartheid continues to be used to enslave black working people in South Africa. International labor has consistently condemned apartheid, and agrees that disinvestment from South Africa is an effective means of pressure.

David Aroner, Executive Director
SEIU Local 535
Timothy Twomey, Secretary-Treasurer
Hospital and Institutional Workers
Local 250
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director
United Public Employees Local 390/400
SEIU

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For the Black majority, apartheid in South Africa means no right to vote, unionize or speak out. Those who resist are murdered, tortured and imprisoned. Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, has been imprisoned for over twenty years. Apartheid is fascism!

U.S. companies investing in South Africa profit from low wages paid to Black workers, and play a key role in keeping apartheid alive. Say NO to apartheid and racism—Vote YES on Prop J.

Henry Clark, Candidate for Congress, Fifth Congressional District
Gloria La Riva
All-Peoples' Congress
Johnnie Stevens
Southern Africa Freedom Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Joint Council of the Service Employees International Union has unanimously endorsed this proposal. The Union took this action because of the economic oppression of citizens by the South African Government, because of the termination of trade union rights and the arrest of union leaders, and because of the moral "Crime against humanity" of Apartheid.

Timothy J. Twomey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

South African apartheid is condemned the world over. Even the Reagan Administration expresses opposition.

Yet South Africa and apartheid continue to flourish, subjecting all non-whites to the vilest humiliations, discrimination, and exploitation.

San Francisco supports apartheid through our investment of municipal pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. By their very presence there, these companies maintain the status quo. Otherwise, the ruling white minority would not welcome these investments! We allow apartheid to continue, despite all the rhetoric we direct at South Africa.

San Franciscans can make responsible investments elsewhere. Voting YES on J, we join other cities in cutting the taproot—foreign finance—which allows the horrors of South Africa to go on, and on, and on... End it! Vote YES, against apartheid!

Executive Committee
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY A PROPOSITION OF ISSUING REVENUE BONDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.312 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $104,000,000 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, FINANCING, IMPROVING AND DEVELOPING WATER DEPARTMENT FACILITIES; AND CONSOLIDATING SAID SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 1984.

WHEREAS, Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the Board of Supervisors in each instance, the Public Utilities Commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities of the San Francisco Water Department subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of Charter Section 7.300, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco by resolution No. 84-0363 adopted July 24, 1984, pursuant to said Section 7.312, has recommended that the Board of Supervisors, by resolution, submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held for that purpose on November 6, 1984, the proposition of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, as it read on June 5, 1984, and Charter Section 7.312 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission in said resolution 84-0363;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

Section 1. A special revenue bond election is hereby ordered and will be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 6, 1984, at which election there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County the proposition of issuing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of providing funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, all as set forth in the following proposition:

Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds

Shall the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to Charter Section 7.312 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing additions, betterments and improvements to the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system, including filtration and treatment works and plants, reservoirs and other water supply, storage and distribution facilities, lands and equipment necessary or convenient for the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system?

Section 2. Said revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 (herein called the “Bonds”) are proposed to be issued to finance improvements to an enterprise (herein called the “Enterprise”) which is herein defined to be the City and County of San Francisco municipal water supply, storage and distribution systems of the San Francisco Water Department, including all of the presently existing municipal water system of the City and County and all additions, betterments, extensions and improvements thereto. Said existing water system and the proposed improvements thereto shall constitute a single, unified integrated enterprise, and the revenues therefrom shall be pledged to the payment of the bonds. It is hereby found and determined that said municipal water system is necessary to enable the City and County to exercise its municipal powers and functions, namely, to furnish sufficient water for any present or future beneficial use of the City and County.

(a) The purpose for which the Bonds are proposed to be issued is to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, including any expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith.

(b) The estimated costs of the acquisition, construction, financing, improvement and development is $104,000,000. Said estimated cost includes all costs and expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, engineering, inspection, legal and fiscal agents' fees, cost of the revenue bond election and of the issuance of the Bonds, bond reserve funds, and working capital and bond interest estimated to accrue during the construction period and for a period of not to exceed 12 months after completion of construction.

(c) The maximum principal amount of the Bonds proposed to be issued is $104,000,000.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco a special revenue bond election the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution, and designates and refers to said proposition in the form of ballot hereinafter prescribed for use at said election.

(a) Said special revenue bond election shall be held and conducted, and the votes thereafter canvassed and the returns thereof made, and the result thereof ascertained and determined as herein provided; and in all particulars not described by this resolution, said special election shall be held and the votes canvassed pursuant to law for general municipal elections in the City and County and pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 52 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) All persons qualified to vote at municipal elections in the City and County upon the date of the election herein provided for shall be qualified to vote upon the proposition submitted at said special revenue bond election.

(c) Said special revenue bond election is hereby consolidated with the general municipal election to be held in the City and County on November 6, 1984, pursuant to the Charter of the City and County. The precincts, polling places and officers of election for said special revenue bond election shall be the same as those established.
and designated for said general municipal election. Reference is hereby made to the notice of election by the Registrar of Voters setting forth the precincts, polling places and officers of election for said general municipal election, to be published on or about October 15, 1984 for more particular description of said precincts, polling places and officers of election.

(d) The ballot used at said general municipal election and said special revenue bond election hereby consolidated therewith have been printed thereon, in addition to all other matters required by law, the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution.

(e) Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absentee voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballots are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

If and to the extent that voting machines are used at said special revenue bond election such machines shall be so arranged that any qualified voter may vote for said proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "YES" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for said proposition, and may vote against it by pulling down a lever over the word "NO" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote against said proposition. The statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material used in voting machines shall read substantially as follows:

$104,000,000 San Francisco Water Department Revenue Bonds.

Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with law.

Section 4. If the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution shall be authorized by the qualified voters of the City and County by the vote of a majority of all the voters voting on said proposition, the Bonds may be issued and sold for the purpose set forth in Section 2 of this resolution.

The Bonds are to be revenue bonds, payable exclusively from the revenues of the Enterprise and such other funds from any source as may be legally available for such purpose and may be used by the City and County for such purpose without incurring indebtedness. The Bonds are not to be secured by the taxing power of the City and County, and shall be issued under Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County. The principal of and interest on the Bonds and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof shall not constitute a debt of the City and County, nor a legal or equitable pledge, charge, lien or encumbrance upon any of its property, or upon any of its income, receipts or revenues except the revenues of the Enterprise and any other funds that may be legally applied, pledged or otherwise made available to their payment. The Bonds, if authorized, shall be special obligations of the Public Utilities Commission and shall be secured by a pledge and shall be a charge upon, and shall be payable, as to the principal thereof, interest thereon, and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof, solely from and secured by a lien upon the revenues of the Enterprise and such funds as may be described in the resolution authorizing the issuance of the Bonds.

The Bonds shall not constitute or evidence indebtedness of the City and County but shall constitute and evidence only an indebtedness of the Public Utilities Commission payable solely out of revenues received by the Public Utilities Commission from San Francisco Water Department facilities operated or controlled by it. The Bonds shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in Section 6.401 of the Charter.

Section 5. This resolution shall be printed in the voters' pamphlet and mailed to each registered voter pursuant to Section 9.105 of the Charter of the City and County.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C, Continued from page 61

bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, a deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy or other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

The department of public works shall have powers and duties relating to street traffic, subject to the laws relating thereto, as follows:

(a) to cooperate with and assist the police department in the promotion of
The chief administrative officer shall have power to appoint and to remove an assistant director of public health for hospital services, who shall be responsible for the administrative and business management of the institutions of the department of public health, including, but not limited to, the San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Home, Hessner Health Home, and the Emergency Hospital Service, and who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of assistant director of public health for hospital services shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the institutions of the department of public health.

The director of public health shall have power to appoint and remove an administrator of San Francisco General Hospital who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of administrator shall be held only by a physician or hospital administrator who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the San Francisco General Hospital.

Health Advisory Board. There is hereby created a health advisory board of seven members, three of whom shall be physicians and one dentist, all regularly certificated. Members of the board shall serve without compensation. They shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer for terms of four years; provided, however, that those first appointed shall classify themselves by lot so that the terms of one physician and one lay member shall expire in 1933, 1934 and 1935, respectively, and the term of one member in 1936.

Such board shall consider and report on problems and matters under the jurisdiction of the department of public health and shall consult, advise with and make recommendations to the director of health relative to the functions and affairs of the department. The recommendations of such board shall be made in writing to the director of health and to the chief administrative officer.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center.

If in the election of June 3, 1980 November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

PART TWENTY-ONE: HEALTH COMMISSION

3.695 Composition of Department; Commission

The public health department shall consist of a health commission, a director of public health and such employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter. The department shall be under the management of a health commission consisting of seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor. Said commission shall have less than a majority of direct providers of health care. Direct providers of health care shall mean all
health professionals and others whose "primary current activity" is the provision of patient care or the administration of facilities or institutions which provide patient care. The term of each member of the commission shall be four years, commencing at twelve o'clock, noon, on the 15th day of January in the year 1985; provided, that the respective terms of office of those first appointed shall be as follows: two for four years, two for three years, two for two years, and one for one year. Vacancies occurring on said commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of each of said members shall be filled by the mayor. No commissioner may serve more than two consecutive terms or a total of eight years.

The compensation of each commissioner shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month. The commissioners shall annually elect one of their members president. They shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the governance of the commission.

3.696 Director of Public Health; Other Executives

The health commission shall appoint a director of public health who shall serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The director of public health shall be a regularly licensed physician in the State of California, with not less than five years' experience in public health administration immediately preceding his or her appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician requirement may be waived by the health commission. The director of public health shall be the chief executive of the commission and shall, subject to the approval of the commission, manage all operations under its jurisdiction. The director shall have power to appoint and remove a deputy director for operations, a deputy director for community health programs, an administrator for San Francisco General Hospital and an administrator for Laguna Honda Hospital. The administrators of San Francisco General Hospital and of Laguna Honda Hospital shall have power to appoint and remove associate administrators to the extent such positions are created by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

These positions shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter and shall be held by persons who possess the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the divisions and institutions of the department. However, any person who has civil service status in any of the above positions on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have such status under the civil service provisions of this charter. All positions in the department legally authorized shall be continued and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.697 Powers and Duties

The health commission shall manage and control the city and county hospitals, emergency medical services, and all matters pertaining to the preservation, promotion, and protection of the lives, health and mental health of the inhabitants of the city and county, except where this charter specifically grants that power to another department. It may also determine the nature and character of public health nuisances and provide for their abatement.

The commission shall inspect the sanitary conditions of the municipal institutions of the city and county, including jails and all public buildings; of the disposition of the dead; of the disposition of garbage, offal and offensive substances.

The commission shall be a policy-making and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in section 3.500 of this charter. The commission shall have the power to establish and make appointments to advisory committees as it shall deem necessary.

8.107 Suspension and Removal

Any elective officer, and any member of the civil service commission, health commission, or public utilities commission or school board may be suspended by the mayor and removed by the board of supervisors for official misconduct, and the mayor shall appoint a qualified person to discharge the duties of the office during the period of suspension. On such suspension, the mayor shall immediately notify the supervisors thereof in writing and the cause therefor, and shall present written charges against such suspended officer to the board of supervisors at or prior to its next regular meeting following such suspension, and shall immediately furnish copy of same to such officer, who shall have the right to appear with counsel before the board in his defense. Hearing by the supervisors shall be held not less than five days after the filing of written charges. If the charges are deemed to be sustained by not less than a three-fourths vote of all members of the board, the suspended officer shall be removed from office; if not so sustained, or if not acted on by the board of supervisors within thirty (30) days after the filing of written charges, the suspended officer shall thereby be reinstated.

The mayor must immediately remove from office any elective official convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, and failure of the mayor so to act shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part.

Any appointee of the mayor, exclusive of civil service, health, recreation and park, and public utilities commissioners, and members of the school board, may be removed by the mayor. Any nominee or appointee of the mayor whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, except the chief administrative officer and the controller, as in this charter otherwise provided, may be removed by a majority of such board and with the concurrence of the mayor. In each case, written notice shall be given or transmitted to such appointee of such removal, the date of effectiveness thereof, and the reasons therefor, a copy of which notice shall be printed at length in the journal of proceedings of the board of supervisors, together with such reply in writing as such official may make. Any appointee of the mayor or the board of supervisors guilty of official misconduct or convicted of crime involving moral turpitude must be removed by the mayor or the board of supervisors, as the case may be, and failure of the mayor or any supervisor to take such action shall constitute official misconduct on his or their part.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F — Continued from page 69

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

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

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

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

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

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

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

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

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

B (b) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection G (g) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection F (f) of this section shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this subsection B (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this subsection B (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said subsection F (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of sixty years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty years, computed under subsection G (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection G (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59½</td>
<td>1.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59¾</td>
<td>1.9250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59¾</td>
<td>1.9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed seventy-five percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection G (g) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within thirty 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of sixty-five 65 years may elect, without right to revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month upon retirement after thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty years, and provided further that as to any member within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for
each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement. 

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

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

1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection E (e): 

A (A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member's 
estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon. 

B (B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary. 

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

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

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

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

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

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

F (f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system.
provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least ten years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000), he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, ninety 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus one and two-thirds(1/2) percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

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

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

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7-1/2) percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection G (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

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

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision § (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of thirty years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

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

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

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

(l) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections B (b), e (c), F (f) and (i) (l) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date; or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.584-5 Death Benefit

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

(a) If no benefit is payable under Subsection B (b) of this section:

(1) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(2) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(b) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Section 8.584-2, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years.

If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subsection (b), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subsection (b) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subsection (a) of this section, the amount of said benefit payable under Subsection (a) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subsection (b) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

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

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

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subsection (a) of this section in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this section, for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so
made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

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

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

Upon the death of a member after retirement, an allowance, in addition to the death benefit provided in the immediately preceding paragraph, shall be paid to his surviving spouse, until such surviving spouse’s death or remarriage, equal to one-half of his retirement allowance as it was prior to optional modification and prior to reduction as provided in subsection (a) of Section 8.514 of this charter, but exclusive of the part of such allowance which was provided by additional contributions. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this paragraph to a surviving spouse unless such surviving spouse was married to said member at least one year prior to his retirement. If such retired person leaves no such surviving spouse, or if such surviving spouse should die or remarry before every child of such deceased retired person attains the age of 18 eighteen years, the allowance which such surviving spouse would have received had he or she lived and not remarried shall be paid to retired person’s child or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION G

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

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 twelve 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 one-year twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve 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 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four 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 thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated in his to the position without prejudice; and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of his the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which he that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee’s eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotive classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall 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.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION H

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments.

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolmen patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the Board of Supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its
duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in §6 section 3.531 of this Charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen and women protective officers classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in §6 section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month now provided in §6 subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean “compensation earnable” as used in §6 section 8.549.

The term “police officers or patrolmen and women protective officers” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by §6 section 8.361 of this Charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in §6 subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month.

(e) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid to firemen and firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman and firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen and firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall
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be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen firefighters classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen firefighters classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing statement is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter. For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firemen" “firefighters” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective rate of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his such member’s service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers or firemen; firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uni-
formed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975–76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(b) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

---

**IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT VOTING**

You can vote for any candidate, regardless of party. This is a General Election and you can vote for any candidate on your ballot. Political party restrictions only apply at Primary Elections (in June).

Do not vote for more than the authorized number of candidates or none of your votes for that contest will be counted. Most candidate contests specify "Vote for one" but you can vote for up to six supervisors and up to four School and College Board members. If you make a mistake and vote for more than six candidates for supervisor you can get a replacement ballot.

If you move, you must re-register. The most common complaint we get on election day is that someone can't vote because they have moved and not re-registered. If you have moved, your name will probably not be on the rolls anymore and even if it is, it is not legal to vote using your old polling place (except in certain rare circumstances). Next time you move, don't leave your vote behind; remember to re-register.

You don't have to be sick or out-of-town to get an absentee ballot. Any voter can request an absentee ballot for any reason, or for no reason. To become a "permanent" absentee voter you must be disabled but ordinary absentee voters do not have to have a reason.

Your registration will not necessarily be cancelled if you don't vote but chances of that happening will increase if you don't vote. After the election, we will send a postcard confirming the address of all nonvoters. If the Post Office or the current resident says you don't live there anymore, your registration will be cancelled. No one is automatically cancelled for not voting at any election.

It is not necessary to re-register before each election. Your registration is permanent and will remain in effect until you move, die or are convicted of a felony.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

STEP 1

Notas: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步
请双手将票向自动機將整張選票插入。

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
请确认将票插入時，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
请把選票之選舉針，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.

STEP 4

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，有空白處供填為投票人應用。
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name __________________________________________

Address _______________________________________ Apt. # _____

Telephone No. (required) __________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) _________________________

Signature __________________________________________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

EXTRA APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Since this page would have been blank anyway, we have used the space to reprint an extra copy of the absentee ballot application form.

Your "real" absentee ballot application appears as a postcard inserted into this book. We would prefer that you use the postcard form because it is easier to process and less likely to get lost.

If two persons in your household are requesting absentee ballots, you may put both postcard forms into an envelope in order to save postage.

The disabled may apply as permanent absentee voters by completing the little box at the bottom of the form. Disabilities that qualify for permanent absentee status include circulatory problems and mobility impairments as well as more severe disabilities.

If you have not yet received your absentee ballot, then you are probably not on our permanent absentee mailing list. The permanent absentee voters' ballots were mailed out the week of October 9th.
Application for absentee ballot appears on Page 48

Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48

缺席選票申請表列在第48页

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the “YES” or after the word “NO”.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrong, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra “Sí” o después de la palabra “No”.

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfura, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvalo al miembro del consejo del precipicio y obtenga otra.
### President and Vice President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMA WONG MAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. MONDALE</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALDINE A. FERRARO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BERGLAND</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES A. LEWIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB RICHARDS</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN KENNEDY SALAMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### United States Representative 5th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ELECCIÓN GENERAL 6 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1984*
(There is no contest for State Senator in this District)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal.)
本區沒有州參議員選舉。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</th>
<th>美議員</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR., Democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker, California Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orador, Asamblea de California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEE S. DOLSON, Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maestro de Universidad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, Board of Supervisors</th>
<th>市参議員</th>
<th>請選最多六人</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Community Service Attorney 社區服務律師</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Administrator 衛生行政人員</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT D. INGRAHAM</td>
<td>Political Consultant 政治顧問</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR M. DAVIS</td>
<td>Hi-Tech Business Woman 高級工藝女商人</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td>Management Consultant 行政管理顧問</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE B. KENNEDY</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors 市参議員</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician 音楽家</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP</td>
<td>Attorney / Member, Board of Supervisors 律師／市参議員</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SALEH ABDULLA</td>
<td>Real Estate Salesman 實業推銷員</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUZANNE ALBERTO</td>
<td>Administrative Secretary 行政秘書</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE RENNE</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors 市参議員</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Political Scientist / Educator 政治學家／教育家</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIANNE MALVEAUX</td>
<td>Economics Professor / Writer 經濟學教授／作家</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN L. MOLINARI</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors 市参議員</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.

(Contest Continued on Next Page)  
(Continua en la siguiente pagina)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Number</th>
<th>Name and Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 107              | EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES  
Banker  
Banquero 銀行家 |
| 109              | JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS  
Executor  
Ejecutor 執行人 |
| 110              | DIANA COLEMAN  
Socialist Union Militant  
Militante Sindicalista 社會主義聯盟鬥士 |
| 112              | RUBY T. JIMENEZ  
Directory Sales Representative  
Representante de Ventas de Directorios 姓名地址資料 銷售員 |
| 113              | ANDREW “DADDY ANDY” JONES  
SFCC Student  
Estudiante de SFCC 市立大學學生 |
| 115              | HARRY BRITT  
Member, Board of Supervisors  
Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員（續下） |
| 116              | RICHARD BRADLEY  
Socialist Union Militant  
Militante Sindicalista 社會主義 聯盟鬥士 |
| 118              | RANDALL BRONNER  
Artist, Musician  
Artista / Músico 藝術家，音樂家 |
| 119              | JONATHAN BULKLEY  
Architect / Neighborhood Planner  
Arquitecto / Planificador 建築師／街坊設計師 |
| 121              | ROGER BOSCHETTI  
T.V. Ethnic Producer  
Productor de Programas Étnicos de Televisión 電視少數民族製作人 |
| 122              | KEVIN STARR  
Businessman, Communicator, Professor  
Hombre de Negocios, Comunicador, Profesor 商人，信息員，教授 |
| 124              | CAROL RUTH SILVER  
Incumbent  
En el Cargo 現任市參議員 |
| 125              | DAVID C. SMITH  
Administrator, Service Agency  
Escrítor, Movimiento Socialista 服務機構行政管理員 |
| 127              | JOHN E. WAHL  
Attorney  
Abogado 律師 |
| 128              | SYLVIA WEINSTEIN  
Writer, Socialist Action  
Escrítor, Movimiento Socialista 作家，社會主義活動家 |

**NOTE**

29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position Details</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>Parent and Teacher Maestra y Madre de Familia 家長和教師</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant Contador Público / Consultor Financiero 持證公共會計師／財政顧問</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>Consultant Consultor 顧問</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE S. HOPP</td>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo 現任教育委員</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICK CERBATOS</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education Miembro, Junta de Educacion 教育委員</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON</td>
<td>Supervisor, Muni Railway Supervisor, Tranvías Municipales 市營公共車監督</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo 現任教育委員</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBBY DENEBEIM</td>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo 現任教育委員</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE DYKSTRA</td>
<td>Community Services Director Director de Servicios Comunitarios 社區服務主任</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>Motor Truck Operator Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST &quot;CHUCK&quot; AYALA</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN GOODMAN</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Actor Maestro/Actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Central Committeeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro del Comité Central del Condado</td>
<td>縣中央委員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE F. PEHARGOU</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant Funcionario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOS C. BROWN</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM WOLFRID</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Clean Water Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $325,000,000 to provide funds for water pollution control, water conservation, and water reclamation projects and activities.</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>State School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance Cleanup Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for hazardous substance cleanup.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $75,000,000 to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Veterans Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $650,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Senior Center Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $50,000,000 to provide funds for senior centers.</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Property Taxation. Fire Protection Systems Exclusion. Empowers Legislature to exclude from property tax reassessment certain newly constructed fire protection improvements. Fiscal Impact: If implemented, estimated local government property tax revenue losses of less than $8 million annually, state government increases in costs to compensate for local school district property tax loss, and state government increases in income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Número</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Medidas Sometidas al Voto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA LIMPIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $325,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para control de la contaminación del agua, conservación del agua y para proyectos y actividades de recuperación del agua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar el desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoría de las escuelas públicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA LIMPIEZA DE SUBSTANCIAS PELIGROSAS. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para limpiar del medio las substancias peligrosas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA POTABLE SALUBRE DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $75,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la mejora de los sistemas de agua domésticos para cumplir con las normas mínimas de agua potable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $550,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA CENTROS PARA PERSONAS DE EDAD MAYOR DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $50,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para centros para personas de edad mayor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE LOS SISTEMAS DE PROTECCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS. Obliga poder a la Legislatura para excluir del recaudo del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas mejorías recientemente construidas para protección contra incendios. Impacto fiscal: De ser llevada a cabo, pérdidas en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad para los gobiernos locales calculadas en menos de $5 millones anuales, además aumentos en los gastos del gobierno estatal para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida en impuestos a la propiedad, y aumentos para el gobierno estatal en los ingresos provenientes del impuesto a la renta debido a menores deducciones en los impuestos a la propiedad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>CORTE SUPREMA. TRANSFERENCIA DE CAUSAS. REVISIÓN DE DECISIONES. Modifica las disposiciones constitucionales en vigencia en cuanto al traspaso de causas y la revisión de decisiones. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto significativo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nota:** El texto en cursiva indica medidas que no se aprobaron.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td><strong>PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT. DISABLED PERSON.</strong> Authorizes Legislature to postpone property tax payments on owner occupied principal residence by disabled person. Fiscal Impact: State expenditures estimated to be less than $2 million annually which would be recovered, with interest, when the homes are sold.</td>
<td>YES 210</td>
<td>NO 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td><strong>PROPERTY TAXATION. HISTORIC STRUCTURE EXCLUSION.</strong> Excludes from property tax reassessment certain new construction on owner occupied principal residence historic structures. Fiscal Impact: Local governments property tax revenue loss of less than $100,000 annually. State government expenditure of about 32% of this to compensate local school districts for property tax revenue losses.</td>
<td>YES 214</td>
<td>NO 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td><strong>TAXATION.</strong> Amends Proposition 13 adding restrictions on real property taxation, new tax measures, and charging fees. Provides specified tax refunds. Fiscal Impact: State revenues reduced at least $100 million, net, over first two-year period. State costs increased up to $750 million over first two-year period and by about $150 million annually in subsequent years to replace revenue losses to schools. Local agencies other than schools property tax and other revenue losses of about $2.8 billion, net, over first two-year period and of about $1.1 billion annually in subsequent years.</td>
<td>YES 223</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td><strong>STATE LOTTERY.</strong> Establishes state-operated lottery. Revenue use: prizes, 50%; expenses, not more than 16%; public education, at least 34%. Fiscal Impact: Cannot be predicted with certainty. Estimated yield for public education would be about $500 million annually, with less the first two years. Estimated division: K-12, 80%; Community Colleges, 13%; California State University, 5%; University of California, 2%.</td>
<td>YES 228</td>
<td>NO 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td><strong>VOTING MATERIALS. ENGLISH ONLY.</strong> Requires Governor urge federal officials amend law so that voting materials be printed in English only. Fiscal Impact: Insignificant.</td>
<td>YES 232</td>
<td>NO 233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POSTERGACIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. PERSONAS INHABILITADAS. Autoriza a la Legislatura a posponer los pagos del impuesto a la propiedad sobre una residencia principal ocupada por su dueño quien sea una persona inhabilitada. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales calculados en menos de $2 millones anuales las cuáles serían recuperadas, con intereses, cuando las residencias sean vendidas.

FUJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE ES- TRUCTURAS HISTÓRICAS. Eximen del pago de los impuestos a la propiedad ciertas construcciones o trabajos nuevos efectuados en residencias que son estructuras históricas ocupadas por sus dueños como el principal lugar de residencia. Impacto fiscal: Pérdidas para los gobiernos locales en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad de menos de $100,000 anuales. Gastos gubernamentales estatales alrededor del 32% de esta suma para compensar a los distintos escuelas locales por la pérdida de ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad.

La Proposición número 35 no será usada en esta elección.

FUJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. Enmienda la Proposición 13 añadiendo restricciones en la fijación de impuestos a la propiedad inmueble, nuevas medidas de impuestos y honorarios a cobrar, dispone reembolsos específicamente referidos a impuestos. Impacto fiscal: Reducción en los ingresos estatales en por lo menos $100 millones netos, durante el primer periodo de dos años. Aumento en los costos estatales de hasta $750 millones durante el primer periodo de dos años y en unos $150 millones anuales en años subsiguientes para reemplazar la pérdida de ingresos para las escuelas. Pérdidas para otras agencias locales, además de para las escuelas, del impuesto a la propiedad y otras pérdidas de ingresos de alrededor de $2.8 mil millones netos, durante el primer periodo de dos años y de alrededor de $1.1 mil millones anualmente en años subsiguientes.

LOTERÍA ESTATAL. Establece una lotería operada por el estado. Uso de los ingresos: premios, el 50%; gastos, no más del 16%; educación pública, por lo menos el 34%. Impacto fiscal: No puede ser predicho con certeza. El rendimiento que se calcula para la educación pública sería de alrededor de $500 millones anuales, siendo menor los dos primeros años. División que se calcula: jardín de infantes al 12avo grado, el 80%; universidades de la comunidad, el 13%; Universidad Estatal de California, el 5%; Universidad de California, el 2%.

MATERIALES DE VOTACIÓN. INGLÉS SOLOMENTE. Requiere que el Gobernador deje a los oficiales federales a que emitan la ley para que los materiales para votación sean impresos en inglés solamente. Impacto fiscal: Insignificante.

州務彩票，設幹由州政府經管的彩票活動，收入所用，獎金，50%；開支，不超過16%；公共教育，最少34%；財政影響，未有肯定地預計，估計每年可為公共教育籌得五億元，頭兩年數額較少，估計將作如何分配，幼稚園至十二年級——80%；社區大學——13%；加州州立大學——5%；加州大學——2%。

只用英文印刷選舉資料，要求州長顥請聯邦官員編訂法例，俾使選舉資料只用英文印制，財政影響，微不足道。
**REAPPORTIONMENT.** Provides reapportioning Senate, Assembly, Congressional, Equalization districts for 1986 and subsequent elections by new commission composed of former justices. Fiscal Impact: Commission costs of up to $3.5 million before 1986 election. Costs of $10,000 to $20,000 each to relocate an unknown number of district legislative offices. County costs of about $500,000 for 1986 election materials. County savings of about $300,000 in 1986 for printing costs, and $200,000 every two years thereafter. Future reapportionments will probably cost less than under existing law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES 237</th>
<th>NO 238</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.** Limits contributors and contributions to elective state office candidates. Opposition candidate's personal expenditures matched by limited public funding. Fiscal Impact: Reduce state revenues by about $100,000 each fiscal year and increase state expenditures by approximately up to $1,650,000 each fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES 242</th>
<th>NO 243</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PUBLIC AID, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.** Creates Public Assistance Commission. Limits benefit expenditures to national average plus 10%. Legislative amendments permitted. Fiscal Impact: Net effect would be combined state and county expenditure reduction beginning July 1, 1986. Size of reduction and impact at different levels of government impossible to determine. Substantial reductions under specified programs would be partially offset to an unknown extent by increased costs under other programs and reduced tax revenues resulting from reduced federal expenditures within the state. Likely, state expenditures would be reduced and county expenditures increased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES 247</th>
<th>NO 248</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES 253</th>
<th>NO 254</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REDISTRIBUCIÓN. Dispone redistribución para los distritos del
Senado, Asamblea, Congreso y de la Junta de Revisión de Avalúos
para 1986 y para las elecciones subsiguientes mediante nueva
comisión compuesta de anteriores jueces. Impacto fiscal: Costos
de la comisión de hasta $3.5 millones antes de la elección de
1986. Costos de $10,000 a $20,000 cada año para resolver un
número desconocido de oficinas legislativas en los distritos.
Costos del condado alrededor de $500,000 para materiales para
la elección de 1986. Ahora para el condado alrededor de
$300,000 en 1986 por costos de impresión y $200,000 cada
dos años de allí en adelante. Las redistribuciones futuras prab-
bablemente costarán menos que bajo la ley actual.

CONTRIBUCIONES PARA COMPAÑÍAS. Limita a los con-
tribuyentes y las contribuciones a candidatos a cargos
de sitios electivos. Igual con fondos públicos lími-
tados los gastos personales del candidato de oposi-
tión. Impacto fiscal: Reduce los ingresos estatales en
unos $100,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal y aumenta
los gastos estatales en aproximadamente hasta $1,650,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal.

AYUDA PÚBLICA, PROGRAMAS DE ASISTENCIA MÉDICA. Crea Comis-
ión de Asistencia Pública. Limita gastos de beneficio al pro-
medio nacional más el 10%. Permite entidades legislativas, Impacto fiscal; el efecto neto sería la reducción de los gastos combinados del estado y del mismo comenzando el 1 de julio de
1986. El tamaño de la reducción y su impacto en los diferentes
niveles del gobierno no es posible determinarse en este momento.
Reducciones basadas a programas específicos serían parcialmente compensadas hasta un grado desconocido mediante el aumento de gastos bajo otros programas y por ingresos de
impuestos reducidos que resulten de gastos federales reducidos
dentro del estado. Es factible que los gastos estatales serían reducidos y que los gastos se aumentarían.

PROPÓSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO 市或提案

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión del Puente a emitir
$42,500,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la
construcción y mejoras de las instalaciones portuarias?

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir $104,000,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones para el Departamento de Aguas?

¿Deberá crearse una Comisión de Salud que consista en miembros nombrados por el Alcalde para dirigir y controlar los servicios de salud en el Condado, y los demás servicios de salud del Condado, y para nombrar un Director de Salud Pública?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?</td>
<td>Yes 261</td>
<td>No 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?</td>
<td>Yes 264</td>
<td>No 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?</td>
<td>Yes 267</td>
<td>No 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?</td>
<td>Yes 270</td>
<td>No 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?</td>
<td>Yes 274</td>
<td>No 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?</td>
<td>Yes 278</td>
<td>No 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and Black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?</td>
<td>Yes 283</td>
<td>No 284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCION GENERAL, 6 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>261 SI</th>
<th>262 NO</th>
<th></th>
<th>264 SI</th>
<th>265 NO</th>
<th></th>
<th>267 SI</th>
<th>268 NO</th>
<th></th>
<th>270 SI</th>
<th>271 NO</th>
<th></th>
<th>274 SI</th>
<th>275 NO</th>
<th></th>
<th>278 SI</th>
<th>279 NO</th>
<th></th>
<th>283 SI</th>
<th>284 NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td>反对</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td>反对</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá autorizarse a la junta de jubilaciones a hacer inversiones de los fondos de jubilación como persona prudente en lugar de hacer inversiones de carácter legal para compañías de seguros?</td>
<td>應否授權退休委員會作退休基金投資時，可用個人判斷謹慎行事，而不必限於作法律容許保險公司所作的投資？</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá la Ciudad subvencionar al cónyuge sobreviviente de empleados activos o retirados de la misma manera que la Ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o retirados en el Sistema de Servicios de la Salud?</td>
<td>市政府給在職身故或退休後去世的僱員的遺偶的保健福利金，應否與在職或退休僱員的津貼相同？</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá pagar un beneficio de doce meses de salario por fallecimiento a diversos oficiales y empleados que mueren como resultado de lesiones físicas externas y violentas durante el transcurso y periodo de empleo?</td>
<td>在工作中或在工作範圍內身體遭受暴力引致的外傷而殉職的各類官員和僱員，應否付給十二個月薪酬的死亡撫恤金？</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá el periodo probatorio para oficiales de policía extenderse de un año a partir de su entrada a un año después de haber completado el entrenamiento pero sin exceder ochenta y cuatro semanas?</td>
<td>應否延長警員的試用期，即從加入警局起一年延至完成訓練後一年的時間，但不能超過八十四個星期?</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá pagar un salario adicional a los miembros del Departamento de Policía asignados a prestar servicio en todas las motocicletas de dos ruedas?</td>
<td>應否給予警局駕駛兩輪摩托車的警員額外報酬，其數額根據加州有350,000人口的城市此種報酬的平均數而定?</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ordenanza de Iniciativa): Deberá San Francisco solicitar al Gobierno Federal que pregunte a los contribuyentes de impuestos si desean que una parte de sus impuestos se use para un exceso gasto militar y si desean que la Ciudad publique un informe anual sobre los impuestos federales recaudados en San Francisco y sobre la parte usada para propósitos militares excesivos y la parte usada para necesidades sociales?</td>
<td>(創制法令)：舊金山應否要求聯邦政府詢求所有納稅人的意見是否願意讓他們的稅款用在過度的軍事費用上，並由市政府每年刊印一份報告，詳列有關聯邦在舊金山所徵稅款，以及用於過度軍事目的和用於社會需要的部分?</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Declaración de Norma): ¿Deberá ser la norma de San Francisco que ningun fondo de pensión administrado por la Ciudad sea invertido en empresas que tienen intereses comerciales en Sudáfrica hasta que sea abolida la segregación racial y se otorgue a la población de raza negra plenos derechos políticos y civiles en Sudáfrica?</td>
<td>(政策聲明)：舊金山應否制訂政策，規定市政府管理的退休基金不能投資在與南非有商業關係的商號，直至南非廢除種族隔離，給予黑人充分的政治權利和民權為止?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

A 如何用自動投票機
B 請特別注意
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

STEP 1

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

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

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
請記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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

D 第三步
請把帶銳之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備寫投票人應用。
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 9, 1984.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election, such as this one, you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot.

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

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature, Supervisors, B.A.R.T., College Governing Board and Board of Education.

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

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

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 6, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 6, 1984.
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

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

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

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 25 through 41 because in June the numbers were 16 through 24.

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

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

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

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

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

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Reprinted by permission of the San Francisco Chronicle.
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JOHN SALEH ABDULLA
My address is 2533 Folsom Street
My occupation is Licensed Real Estate Salesman
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: I graduated at a local public high school. I also attended private business schools. I am presently a licensed real estate salesman.

Knowing the city's acute housing and employment problems, I am deeply concerned of the these problems and would like to be in a position to find solutions to these problems. While I have no immediate solutions; if elected, I promise the people of San Francisco that I will devote all of my time to finding solutions to these problems by utilizing all resources available to public officials in solving these problems.

John Saleh Abdulla

The sponsors for John Saleh Abdulla are:
Saleh M. Abdulla, 155 Clipper St., Janitor
Sam Bachman, 238 Eddy St., Janitor
Richard F. Bourdon, 165 Clipper St., Mover
Peter Bury, 555 Post St., Musician
Freddie Contona, 1419 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Alfred Catalin, 1459 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Bernard Fabrao, 3609-18th St., Deputy Clerk
Robert Fulghum, 487 Joo St., Business Representative
Saleh M. Ghanem, 155 Clipper St., Maintenance
Stephen A. Halbe, 1202-23rd Ave., Musician
Jamal Jawad, 488 Ellis St., Business Owner
Zelma Ann Johnston, 575 O'Farrell St., Retired
Barbara D. Jones, 1421 South Van Ness Ave., Housewife
Alfred E. Kelly, 610 Polk St., Retired Union Official
Yhya S. Mohamed, 640 Eddy St., Maintenance
Brian Charles Percy, 333 Hyde St., Payroll clerk
Charles Ridgell, 347 Lexington St., Business Representative,
Janitors Union
James Roy Sellers, 575 O'Farrell St., Unemployed
Madeline Smith, 159 Clipper St., Housewife
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect

SUZANNE ALBERTO
My address is 25 Pinto Avenue
My occupation is Administrative Secretary
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I am a Hispanic-Filipina (English/Spanish-speaking) administrative-secretarial San Francisco worker and Muni commuter and have been a resident voter since 1968.

I believe San Franciscans would be better served if suitable inquiry and evaluation preceded passage of locally needed and desired legislation and tax revenue expenditures to assure anticipated results. San Francisco's Charter permits supervisorial inquiry into expenditures. I strongly support thoroughly researched legislation and tax revenue use to benefit the peoples of San Francisco.

All of my sponsors know me to be a capable, persistent fighter for principles and public benefit and believe I would be an excellent supervisor.

Suzanne Alberto

The sponsors for Suzanne Alberto are:
L. J. Alberto, 4156-25th St., Communication Technician
Alwin E. Bernstein, 6 Roanoke St., Computer Analyst
David Carlton Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Tape Librarian
Sarah M. Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Programer/analyst
Rose Violet Descilo, 215 Niagara Ave., Retired Bookkeeper
Deirdra D. Dunlap, 125 DeMontfort Ave., Telecomm Specialist
R. L. Feather, 111 Inverness St., Secretary
Angel Fernandez, Jr., 1419-11th Ave., Security Officer
David L. Forks, 26 Shields St., Janitor
Paul F. Gurn, 2387-44th Ave., Security Guard
Joyce A. Glynn, 38 Serrano Dr., Legal Secretary
Margery M. Gray-Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Financial Administrator
Amy J. Koehler, 2006 Fell St., Office Manager
Cheryl Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Housewife
Cheryenne Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Welder
David Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Truck Driver
Ruth Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Housewife
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St., Custodian
Dewey W. McNeil, 251 Topeka Ave., Utility Engineer
Leon Medina, 1725 Church St., Retired-Laborer
Nathan Nemer, 125 Compton Dr., Retired-Produce Buyer
Patricia J. Powell, 2006 Fell St., Publishing
Petty Randall, 366 Wilde St., Grocery Clerk
Roberto Sampera, 328 Staples Ave., Sr. Draper
Clifford C. Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Mechanic
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Clerical
E. L. Thompson, 111 Inverness St., Student
Kenneth E. Tucker, Jr., 243 Hahn St., Building and Grounds Patrolman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROGER BOSCHETTI
My address is 20 Carnelian Way
My occupation is Television Producer, Host, Writer, and Labor Consultant
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of involvement with working men, women, and young people, and as a concerned citizen, I will work to implement laws which will benefit all the people of San Francisco, such as reducing payroll and business tax, so as to encourage small businesses to come or stay in San Francisco, thereby creating more jobs. Will implement constructive changes in muni for speedier, safer and effective service, I will also create better programs to help the needs of our young men and women, I would like more police foot patrol, and more affordable housing, with more concern for our senior citizen

Roger Boschetti

RICHARD BRADLEY
My address is 1 Ardhath Court
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As a supporter of the Spartacist League I twice tore down the Confederate flag of slavery which flies no more in Civic Center. The American Civil War did not complete its historic mission. It will take a third American revolution, a socialist revolution, to liberate black people.

Spike Reagan’s anti-Soviet war plans and union-busting austerity drive by mass strike action! U.S. imperialism—hands off Central America! Smash Klan/Nazi terror through labor/black action! Break with Democrats—enemies of labor/minorities! Build a workers party that will stop at nothing short of socialist revolution and a workers government!

Richard Bradley

The sponsors for Roger Boschetti are:
William A. Arietta, 16 Wheat St., Police Officer
Rita M. Belli, 158 Greenwich St., Assessment Clerk
Rachel Boschetti, 20 Carnelian St., Cosmetologist
George Contes-Teuer, 531 O’Farrell St., Instructor/Professor
Bernard M. Crotty, 2971-23rd Ave., City Employee
John E. Downey, 83 Gaviota Way, Nationally Known Referee/ Limo Driver/Boxing Judge
Curtis Elliott, 350 Glenview Dr., Doorman
Evelyn C. Fitzgerald, 230 Stonecrest Dr., School Administrator
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Dr., Labor Consultant
Robert Jacobs, 438-38th Ave., Business Agent
Roger Micheli, 2655 Chestnut St., Goldengate Disposal
Robert T. Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Lieutenant S.F.P.D. Retired
Shirley Robin Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Investigator
Marie G. Neilsen, 319 Maynard St., Businesswoman
Marie Ann Perri, 80 Malta St., Corporate Secretary
Joseph J. Phillips, 1203 Clayton St., Attorney
John E. Ricci, 1224 Broadway, Lawyer
Don L. Rotan, 134 Gilbert St., Writer
Samuel Smith, 297 Allison St., Seaman Cook
Carmen Solis, 39 Majestic Ave., Restaurant Owner
Rose M. Tarantino, 160 Country Club Dr., Housewife
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
John J. Vidal, Sr., 1437 Judah St., Office Manager
Winston Wong, 225 Anzavista Ave., Manager of American Cab Co.
Herman W. Young, 210 Brookdale Ave., Seaman
Maya Dhillon-Zyga, 455 Chenery St., Homemaker

The sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Diana Coleman, 605 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Dawna D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2430-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikegami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 780 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennise Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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HARRY BRITT

My address is 783A Guerrero Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: As a full-time Supervisor, I’ve worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making city government respond to our needs.
• I’ve supported crime-reducing neighborhood patrols to protect seniors;
• fought to repeal the sewer service charge;
• worked to protect the quality of our neighborhoods and environment;
• secured funding for anti-gay violence programs, AIDS prevention, community arts programs;
• sponsored protections for renters and small businesses from skyrocketing rents;
• worked to create affordable housing;
• sponsored equal pay for comparable jobs;
• worked to have downtown pay its share of taxes;
• worked to save jobs when companies moved from San Francisco.

Harry G. Britt

The sponsors for Harry G. Britt are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Sala Burton, 8 Stato Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman
John L. Molina, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister, Community College Board Member
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Member, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator
Yori Wada, 505-4th Ave., Regent-University of California
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner, Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., President, Harvey Milk Club
Sall Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., President, Alice B. Toklas Club
Wayne Friderick, 1095-14th St., Newspaper Political Editor
Tom Murray, 4715 Balboa St., Newspaper Editor
Thomas F. Waddell, M.D. 141 Albion St., Athletic Games Organizer
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Affordable Housing/Tenant’s Rights Worker
Edward L. Peet, 350 Arabbo Dr., Senior Citizen’s Advocate
John Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Sierra Club
Louise Ogden, 1674 Fillbert St., President, National Women’s Political Caucus
Leon Besechensky, 55-10th Ave., Firefighter
Howard Gloyd, 553 Noriega St., Minister
Andrea Jepson, 1334 Masonic Ave., Nuclear Freeze Leader
Philip E. De Andre, 601 Mississippi St., Small Business Owner
Georgianna Lynn, 165 El Venado St., West Portal Avenue
Business Owner
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon St., Registered Nurse

RANDALL DWAYNE BRONNER

My address is 1390 Market Street
My occupation is artist-musician
My age is 30

My qualifications for office are: San Francisco Budget Surplus-$162 Million.
• Muni Fare/Fast Pass Revenue-$46 Million.
• Aspen, Colorado-Free buses ten years.
• Portland-Free buses downtown.

We residents pay for more than two thirds of Muni’s cost in our taxes. Residents should ride Muni for free!

You must check out the murals supporting Peace in Central America on Balmy Street.

Please call 864-8641 if you’d like to meet the survivors of 1906, free, at the Great Earthquake Exposition.

If you want to brighten up your street call San Francisco Street Gardeners for free cuttings, succulents, and flowers, at the same number.

Randall Bronner

The sponsors for Randall Bronner are:

Selig R. Raphael, 495-32nd Ave., Survivor 1906 Quake
Jane Dornacker, 9 Central Ave., Reporter
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
William T. Witter, 948 Haight St., Artist
James T. Lyon, 1761 Page St., Musician
F. Kelly Martin, 119 Margaret Ave., Cateress
Julie Tinsel, 1653 Washington St., Waitress
Raymundo E. Pena, 1470 Fulton St., Waiter
Mary L. Martinez, 295 Moscow St., Secretary
Sandra Renzi, 861 Post St., Waitress and Prep Worker
Giorgio Irving, 1390 Market St., Waiter
Martin James, 1139 Broadway, Bartender
Elizabeth Kelly, 3249 Pierce St., Restaurant Services
Anthony R., Parrinello, 312 Precita Ave., Artist
Carlos Gonzalez, 3409-20th St., Community Worker
Robert Burnside, 2548 Folsom St., Carpenter
Susan Cervantes, 398 Precita St., Artist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
James A. Lewis, 3030 Cabrillo St., Artist/Teacher
Julianne Malveaux, 26 Winfield St., Economist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JONATHAN BULKLEY
My address is 147 Tenth Avenue
My occupation is Architect, Neighborhood Planner
My age is 54
My qualifications for office are: Experienced Architect and Planner. President, Planning Association for the Richmond; Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. Member: Open Space Committee, Mayor's Task Forces for Parking, Mechanical Amusement Devices and Sidewalk Displays.

My Architecture / Planning background will help me respond to the need for a coherent vision of San Francisco as a City that works for everyone.

My priorities include:
• Housing for those most in need—singles, working women, seniors.
• Crime-free streets
• Civil service preference for San Francisco residents.
• Caring solutions to seniors’ needs.
• Eliminating Bay pollution.
• Maintaining Neighborhood Character, Diversity, and Liveability.

The interests of San Francisco Residents will always come first!

Jonathan Bulkley

DIANA COLEMAN
My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I am a supporter of the Spartacists, the labor/socialists who put a stop to flying the Confederate flag, banner of KKK racism and slavery, in Civic Center. Finish the Civil War! Forward to a workers government!

Without socialist revolution catastrophe threatens mankind. We need an integrated workers party that will take the productive wealth from the capitalist bosses, and establish a workers government and socialist planned economy.

Spke Reagan reaction through mass strikes! Military victory to Salvadoran leftists! Defend the USSR! No support to Democrats—liberal party of imperialism! Smash Taft-Hartley! Labor’s gotta play hardball to win!

Diana Coleman

The sponsors for Diana Coleman are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Richard Bradley, 1 Arduith Ct., Maintenance Building
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 359B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-26th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikegami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennyse Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan K. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

The sponsors for Jonathan Bulkley are:
Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Tenant Representative, Rent Stabilization Board
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., S.F. Housing Commissioner
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Ter., Former City Planning Commissioner
Lee Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor; Former Supervisor
Jose Luis Fernandez, 464-43rd Ave., Businessman; Vice President, MAPA
Russell B. Flynn, 2610 Filbert St., President, Rent Stabilization Board
Ann Fogelberg, 2980 Vallejo St., Housewife; Vice Pres., Cow Hollow Association
Terry Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney; Former Supervisor
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Public Utilities Commissioner
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer
Ruth Gravas, 74 Mazuph St., Glen Park Association
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Port Commissioner; Past President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
John Hooper, 201 Buena Vista East, Conservationist; President, Buena Vista Neighborhood Ass’n.
Don Huruzzy, 54 Kelsoe Ave., Former Supervisor
John H. Kirkwood, 1635 Green St., Member, BART Board
Bill Kuhns, 4215-26th St., Co-Chair, Open Space Committee
Linn P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner
Richard Livingston, 380 Robart St., Administrator, Reality House
West; Member, Open Space Committee
Peter McCrea, 1024 Lake St., Businessman; Past Pres., Public Utilities Comm.
Amy Meyer, 3627 Clement St., Rec. & Park Commissioner
William F. O’Keefe, Sr., 444 Corbett Ave., President, S.F. Taxpayers Association
Thomas R. Peretti, 3787-16th St., Banker; President, C.R.I.R.
Alan Raznick, 237 Topaz Way, Attorney; President, Coalition for S.F. Neighborhoods
Toby Rosenblatt, 3409 Pacific Ave., Businessman; Pres., City Planning Commission
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
Sam Valentino, 500 College Ave., Retired; Past President St. Mary’s Park Improvement Club

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ELEANOR M. DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Accounting Services
My qualifications for office are: My experience with community groups and City Hall is extensive.
Involved in local politics through neighborhood and merchant associations, worked on campaigns for Diane Feinstein, and many others. Served the community through the following organizations: Vice President, Clement Merchants, head of legislative committee; Consultant to Polk Merchants; Member, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Roundtable, Vice Chair Health Committee; Board, California Alcohol Treatment Services; Chairperson Alcohol Awareness; Appointee, Mayor's Task Force on Sidewalk Vending, Parking; San Francisco Outlook, Project Manager; Member, SPUR; Boardmember Public Research Institute, SFSU.
A loyal devotee of San Francisco. I will serve honestly with an open mind and heart.

Eleanor M. Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor M. Davis are:
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-23rd Ave., Teacher
Robert R. Beci, 2478-23rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Rachael Balyeat, 2323 Hyde St., Investor
Luis A. Belmonte, 250 Walnut St., Real Estate Developer
Mildred Burrell, 2970 Pine St., General Contractor
Leslie A. Burton, 1328 Baker St., Attorney
Rose Cassano, 863 Carolina St., Artist
Toni Delacorte, 2025 Hayes St., Public Relations Executive
Catherine J Dodd, 61 Damning St., Registered Nurse
John Richard Doyle, 109-12th Ave., Attorney at Law
Adrienne Bell Falk, 1000 Green St., Housewife
Rory A. Flood, 1070 Revere St., Owner, Fine Furniture Company
Patricia Hooper, 562 Arkansas St., Writer
Walter G. John, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman and Library Commissioner
Paul Raynor Keating, 180-4th Ave., Attorney at Law
Dennis E. Kirkley, 1344 Larkin St., Manager of Gift Shop
Beatrice Kushner, 35 Presidio Ter., Attorney at Law
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Ted R. Moulton, 17 Leroy Pl., Architect
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Owner, Data Processing Company
Kenneth E. Rovell, 1315-3rd Ave., Engineer
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Liquor Store Owner and Chairman of Parking Authority
Robert L. Strauss, 1734-9th Ave., Graduate Student
Debbie Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner
Larry Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner

EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES

My address is 695 John Muir Drive
My occupation is Banker
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Forty-four years after my grandparents were married here in San Francisco just seven months after the nineteen hundred and six earthquake. A beautiful blond hair, blue eyed baby boy came bouncing out of St. Joseph's Hospital. Studying economics at St. Mary's College after attending Riordan and then leaving religious life to create a conservation newspaper. Trying to educate local residents about the serious problems that we faced here in San Francisco and the bay area. If allowed to fulfill my dreams of what we can accomplish I will gladly give twenty-five per cent of my salary to charity.

Edward Michael Hayes

The sponsors for Edward Michael Hayes are:
Edwin B. Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Miriam Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Agnes Cassidy, 385 Day St., Retired
Anna M. d'Ottillie, 1356 Dolores St., Housewife
Bertram J. d'Ottillie, 1356 Dolores St., Retired
Mary M. Driscoll, 342-28th St., Administrative Assistant
John L. Flynn, 54 Seaview Terr., Banker
Elsie A. Gilligan, 133 Randall St., Banker
Rae Grubstick, 2479-40th Ave., Banker
Marcia Kocel, 44 Mallorca Way, Bank Clerk
Berneke Langley, 460 Duncan St., Retired
Bernadine K. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Housewife
William G. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William D MacGiffrey, 2720-35th Ave., Banker
Michael J. McCarthy, 3744-22nd St., Retired
Nora S. McManus, 456 Duncan St., Retired
Ellen McSweeney, 457 Duncan St., Retired
Aileen P. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Mary C. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Leona G. Parker, 56 Harper St., Housewife
James L. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Clerk
Janet M. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Secretary
Rita M. Phipps, 230 Prospect Ave., Retired
Eugene F. Sullivan, 426 Duncan St., Ironworker
Catharine C. Tassone, 1795 Sanchez St., Clerk
Nellie Twomey, 1325 Church St., Home-maker
Seymour Whitelaw, 3150 Clay St., Investment Broker
Ann M. Willis, 1365 Dolores St., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT DANIEL INGRAHAM
My address is 1637 Noriega Street
My occupation is Political Consultant
My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: Over one hundred years ago two great men, David Broderick and Edward Baker, gave their lives to save this Republic.

I ask you voters to compare these two San Franciscans with the small minded politicians of today.

Pathetic Wendy Nelder says "Fluoride causes AIDS"; degraded Willie Brown corrupts us with "Oh What a Night" bacchalia; Feinstein lusts for higher office, and the rest are worse.

San Francisco can play an historic role in the development of the Pacific Basin. But you, our citizens, must decide. I urge you: Join with me and other candidates of Lyndon LaRouche's NDPC in our fight.

Robert Daniel Ingraham

RUBY T. JIMENEZ
My address is 961 Delano Avenue
My occupation is Directory Sales Representative
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: A San Francisco resident since, 1948 and a naturalized American of Mexican decent, I consider myself an earnest interpreter of human needs for the Hispanic community and other minorities. Misinterpretations, injustices, lack of communication and mutual respect must be addressed and aired. These human needs for minorities and others can be solved if we end the current world depression. The humane world economic policies of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly his proposal for joint economic development between the United States and Ibero-America (Operation Juarez) can end this depression. The port of San Francisco should be expanded to become a strong world trade center.

Ruby T. Jimenez

The sponsors for Robert Ingraham are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Gracelita Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3258 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 357 Belvedere St., Forklift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elaina Hardy, 143 Farrellnes St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative

The sponsors for Ruby T. Jimenez are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Gracelita Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Stanley J. Bolinski, 1909 Eddy St., Staff Clerk
Willa W. Coleman, 215 Munich St., Sales Representative
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
Patricia L. Hardy, 178 Broad St., Assistant Manager
Patricia Helton, 93 Prentiss St., Teacher, Mission Community College
Andrew Konviser Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ria Lee Jones, 359 Orizaba Ave., Staff Clerk
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEruth Miller, 12 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ANDREW ("DADDY ANDY") JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Criminology Student
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I have been a respected citizen and server of San Francisco for 25 years. I'm involved in many community organizations that care for our community such as Glide church, Red Cross volunteers and the Singel partents resource center. I've been appointed to sit on the board of such organizations as "Mission Coalition, Mission Model Neighborhood and the Mission Education program, (appointed by Major Alioto and Mayor Moscone). I'd like to dedicate my supervorial campaign to a few of the many people who helped me over the years, Chef Roy Hammerich, Betty Romenoff and the Mission Childcare Consortium.

Andrew Daddy Andy Jones

The sponsors for Andrew (Daddy Andy) Jones are:

Stephen Harold Irvine, 2037 15th St., Carpenter
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Joseph A. DelCarlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Chairperson of MHD
David L. Butler, 895 Shotwell St., Salesman
Diane Mounanu, 45 Watchman Way, Graduate Student
David Levinson, MD, 2927 Folsom St., Physician
Helen Butler, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife
Joseph A. Maclellan, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Cashier
E. Perry Watson, 2866 Harrison St., Architect
Rose Sillard, 10 Lucky St., Housewife
John Maras, 20-12th St., Student
Donald Strickland, 981 Shotwell St., Musician & Carpenter
Juanita Del Carlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Hiring Hall Director
Oscar Herrera, 360 Holyoke St., Educator
Delmar T. Burge, 142 Central Ave., Professional Musician
Rose Macclellan, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Jesse S. Valencis, 751 Castro St., Job Developer
Peter Anthony Rivera, 57 Peters Ave., Counselor
Fernando Cosio, 177 Johnstone Dr., Executive Director
Miguel Quinoz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Social Worker
Harry W. Madison, 4017 Folsom St., Appliance Repair
Paul Sussman, 1243 Third Ave., Housing Finance
Carmencita L. De la Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Kathryn M. McCamant, 625 Scott St., Tenant Organizer
Lynne Beeson, 2135-28th Ave., Grants Coordinator
Harry E. Baker, 1345 Clement St., Project Coordinator

WILLIE B. KENNEDY

My address is 950 Duncan Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: In my three years as Supervisor, I have worked to maintain and improve the unique quality of life we have in San Francisco—from rent control to fighting for parks and open spaces. I honor our rich diversity of cultures and life styles through support of neighborhood preservation and the rights of all groups—from children to seniors.

I initiated a campaign to control the tragic increase in child abuse; and I am working hard on the problem of decreased employment, particularly for youth.

I want to continue serving your interests in making this the most liveable city in the United States.

Willie B. Kennedy

The sponsors for Willie B. Kennedy are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Elected Official, Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Stout Blvd., Member of Congress
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor/Airport Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney At Law
Harry G. Britt, 78-A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Apriano R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman St., Member, Board of Education
Handy Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant, Commissioner PUC
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Union Official
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Lim P. Lee, 1086 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Aldo P. Lera, 1177 California St., Electrical Contractor
Cyril Maginn, 1 Nobhill St., Philanthropist
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
James McCray, Jr., 164-6th Ave., Minister
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Gina Moscone, 50 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
Adolph Schuman, 1170 Sacramento St., Businessman
Stan Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 69 HIliritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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**ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES**

My address is 121 Golden Gate Avenue
My occupation is Musician

My qualifications for office are: I am one of many in unity with San Francisco's diversity. I "Keys" will open doors for you, to: homes, jobs, health care, better schools, provide more: complimentary fine arts, concerts, veterans benefits, senior services; close doors on pornography, drugs and prostitution; clean our streets and make them safe once more; eliminate wasteful spending and lower your taxes. For reasons like these, I am your "Keys". Never again, will any San Franciscan go wanting, while "special interest" lick their fingers. Let us shine bright, the city that knows how, a guiding light to world peace now.

God help us.

*Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes*

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys are:
Gary Gene Adams, 139-5th Ave., Plastic Fabricator
Wayne Austin, 391 Leavenworth St., Job Developer
Brian Chew, 334-30th Ave., Restaurant Worker
Ginger Coyote Coleman, 734 Bush St., Editor of Punk Globe
Hugh T. Dauley, 1177 California St., Computer Operator
Thomas A. Finney, 165 Turk St., Disabled/SSI
Howard M. Grayson, 160 Eddy St., Community Coordinator,
  Hosp. House
Louis J. Gwerder, 427 Valley St., Laborer
Mickey C. Helmol, 777 Tehama St., Patriot
John R. Hess, 554 Broadway St., Doorman
Kevin M. Kennedy, 250 McAllister St., Social Worker
Patricia E. Kerman, 1026 Montgomery St., Film Maker
John Lyman, 149-6th St., Musician
Patrick Marsh, 231-27th St., Chef
Perry V. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Teacher
Michelle Miller, 15 Surrey St., Student
David M. Moebes, 350 Frederick, Symphonic Musician
Keith F. Moog, 1233 Guerrero St., Controller
Gary Posner, 443 Broadway St., Engineer
Steven Present, 373 Ellis St., Security Officer
Clark Sullivan, 765 Ellis St., Political Activist
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Office/Clerical
Robin Vega, 1330 Jessie St., Courier
H. Joseph Wagner, 121 Goldengate Ave., Musician
James E. Washington, Jr., 55 Mason St., Consultant, Arts and Science
Guy West, 640 Polk St., Broadcasting
Linda Marie White, 777 Tehama St., Seamstress

**DAVID L. KILBER**

My address is 1901 Noriega Street
My occupation is Management Consultant
My age is 40

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of Oregon State University, a Vietnam Veteran, and a former candidate for California State Assembly. I have resided in the Sunset district with my wife Susan for five years.

I stand for a strong defense policy including the Beam Weapon anti-missile defense and the technology boom this new "Apollo" program will bring to the local economy.

San Francisco must become a center for science, classical culture, and trade, bringing blue-collar families and industry back to this city. We must expand the Port of San Francisco and launch the Pacific Basin development strategy proposed by economist Lyndon LaRouche.

*David L. Kilber*

The sponsors for David L. Kilber are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Bellah, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlif Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallonites St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1837 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1729-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 224 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Michael M. Leccano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozalski, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
Edith Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retired
J.G. Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retailer

*Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.*
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QUENTIN L. KOPP

My address is 68 Country Club Drive
My occupation is Attorney/Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: Local government is us, because we depend upon it to provide essential services and wise leadership. For 13 years I've fought to cut governmental waste and excessive taxation, to keep government honest and on its toes. My efforts have already saved taxpayers over $250,000,000 and I'm proud to be the one supervisor who watches how every dollar is spent. This year City government will spend an average $4,500,000 a day, every day. I want to continue my role as your "financial watchdog" in City Hall and add a needed balance to the Board. I would very much appreciate your support.

Quentin L. Kopp

The sponsors for Quentin L. Kopp are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Former Mayor
John J. Barbagelata, 15 Lorenzo Way, Former Member of the Board of Supervisors
A. Marquez Baistista, 1355 Powell St., Attorney at Law
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Businessperson
Robert C. Elkus, 469 Magellan Ave., Attorney at Law
George Evankovich, 1600-A Greenwich St., Labor Representative
Terry A. Francine, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Jack E. Frankel, 72-22nd Ave., Rabbi
Merla Zellerbach Goerner, 225 Presidio Ter., Author/Journalist
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Attorney at Law
Carlton Goodlett, 2900 O'Farrell St., Publisher
Paul D. Hurdman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author/Retired Publisher
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Golda Kaufman, 2900 Pacific Ave., Homemaker/Volunteer
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070-26th Ave., Congressional Assistant
Joseph P. Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
John Lo Schiavo, 2130 Fulton St., Priest/Educator
Haig G. Mardikian, 2960 Divisadero St., Businessman
Frances M. McAfee, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired President of City Employees
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Harriet C. Salaro, 95 Crestlake Dr., Self Employed Businesswoman
Burn A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Police Commissioner
Dorothy Vukich, 177 San Aleso Ave., Housewife/Volunteer
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo Drive
My occupation is Political Scientist/Educator
My age is 29

My qualifications for office are: impressive. A full decade of political activism at national, state, and local levels. Leadership roles in labor, housing, and education. To illustrate my seriousness in leading our City, I have launched the following initiative campaigns:

* A 3-year rent freeze
* Commercial rent control
* A balanced budget
* Expedition of labor disputes
* Driver-ownership of taxicabs
* An outdoor stadium in front of Moscone Center
As your supervisor, I will pursue:

* District elections for district councils
* Metro services for the Richmond, Marina, Bayview
* Higher police standards
* More schools and parks
You need me now, San Francisco! Who else you gonna call?

Julian O. Lagos

The sponsors for Julian Lagos are:
Charles Martin Adams, 54 4th St., Cab Driver
Scherrie Rae Ahoen, 577 Arballo Dr., Psychologist
Elizabeth Alavez, 1262 La Playa St., Sales
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall St., Computer Consultant
Elizabeth Benford, 508 Andover St., Attorney
Katherine Bobrowski, 417 Stockton St., Unemployed
Thomas J. Callan, 17 Sutro Heights Blvd, Consultant
James D. Cantor, 742 Treat Ave., Station Attendant
Henry Conserva, 1258 40th Ave., Professor
Leon Datangel, 725 Van Ness Ave., Businessman
Peggy L. Dickson, 320 Monticello, Student
Mark Emery, 555 Taylor St., Artist
James Michael Faye, 1309-B Page St., Tenant Advocate
Pheomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore St., Videographer
Ken Johnson, 42 Kellloch St., Cabdriver
Vincent B. Lattimer, 4118-A 24th St., Service Manager
Richmond Loevinsohn, 1341 Valencia St., Writer
John B. Loretz, 905 Columbus Ave., Cab Driver/Fisherman
Bernice Martin, 506 Church St., Public Stenographer
Jonathan Mc Curdy, 80 Alvarado St., Attorney
Victor E. Miller, 1341 Valencia St., Editor
Steven A. Schectman, 1301 20th St., Attorney
William F. Taylor, 1850 Clay St., Operating Engineer
Frank S. Warner, 2530 Fillmore St., Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 249 Cotter St., Legal Worker
Candidates for Supervisor

JULIANNE MALVEAUX

My address is 26 Winfield Street
My occupation is Economics Professor/Labor Specialist/Writer
My age is 30

My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan and former White House staffer (1977–78) Dr. Julianne Malveaux (pronounced “Mal-Voh”) is an elected California State Central Committee woman who is committed to a diverse San Francisco:

—San Francisco Tomorrow Board Member
—Booker T. Washington/Ella Hill Hutch Board Member
—Strong Supporter: Mondale-Ferraro
—Steering Committee, San Francisco Plan Initiative
—Delegate candidate for Jesse Jackson
—Former staff, President’s Council of Economic Advisers
—Ph.D. (Economics, MIT)
—Co-author of three books
—Columnist, San Francisco Sun Reporter
—Priority focus: job creation programs for youth, minorities, and women
—Author, 1984 Ballot Proposition J which prohibits San Francisco pension fund investments in South Africa.

Julianne Malveaux

The sponsors for Julianne Malveaux are:

Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
Judith Breckia, 609 Kansas St., Lawyer, City Commissioner
Randall Bronner, 1390 Market St., Artist/Musician
Rene Cazenave, 2821-22nd St., Housing Advocacy
Terence Faulkner, 2371 42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Thomas C. Fleming, 2171 O’Farrell St., Journalist
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Margaret A. Gannon, 2640-18th St., Attorney
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Yvonne S. Golden, 1743-9th Ave., School Administrator
Peter M. Good, 709 Shadrer St., Arborist
Roberto Y. Hernandez, 852 Moultrie St., Director, Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer
Doris W. Kahn, 329 Clay St., Transportation Commissioner
Tony Kilroy, 475-11th Ave., President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Michael Koblenz, 825 Masonic Ave., Distributor
Orella Langston, 55 Friendship Way, Senior and Geriatric Specialist
Arthur Lathan, 2359-48th Ave., Personnel Administrator
Michael C. Miller, 1920 Quint St., Attorney
Jack D. Morrison, 44 Woodland Ave., Management consultant
Carl Diao Reece, 2034-46th Ave., Graduate Student
Ruth Gordon Schnapp, 726-23rd Ave., Structural Engineer
Frances M. Shaskan, 259-32nd Ave., Consumer Rights Advocate
Anita Silvers, 15 Osgo St., Professor, S.F. State
Arlo Smith, 66 Fernando Way, District Attorney
Bruce M. StCyr, 343 Chester Ave., Vice President AFSCME Local 2620
Ida V. Strickland, 1664 Fulton St., Administrator
Calvin Welch, 519 Ashbury St., Community Consultant

JOHN L. MOLINARI

My address is 30 16th Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: To make San Francisco work takes both good ideas and cooperation with everyone.

For over 12 years as your Supervisor, my contribution has been to bring together both the diverse viewpoints of San Francisco’s many communities and the other Supervisors to solve our City’s problems. With your support, I’ve:

—Promoted the construction of more housing; limited condominium conversions to protect renters; protected tenants from rent gougers and outrageous security deposits;
—Initiated escort services to protect seniors;
—Initiated preferential parking and parking ticket amnesty programs;
—Protected our neighborhood character from big companies forcing out small merchants; and
—Protected San Francisco’s parks and playgrounds.

John L. Molinari

The sponsors for John L. Molinari are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
George Christopher, 1707 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
John Francis Foran, 900 Rockdale Dr., State Senator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Nancy C. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rosario Araya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Lourdes K. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Homemaker/Media Producer
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Member, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Pastor
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director, Patient Advocacy
Gordon J. Lao, 540 19th Ave., Member, Port Commission
Yuri Wada, 505 4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Duke J. Armstrong, 352 Divisadero St., Former President, C.R.I.R.
Paul Bonesteel, 647-A Castro St., President, Stonewall Gay Political Club
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, Community United Against Violence
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter (B.A.R.)
Carole Migden, 261 35th St., Member, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Political Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington Way, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Political Club
Maureen J. Conroy, 650 Eucalyptus Dr., Homemaker
John M. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Chair, Sierra Club Bay Chapter
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus
Michael S. Sallano, 95 Crestlake Dr., Sunset District Merchant

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PAT NORMAN
My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Senior Health Care Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I am a political progressive with extensive professional experience as an administrator, program consultant, mediator, and service provider. These skills and my perspective will be valuable additions to the Board.
My commitment to economic and social justice is backed by 25 years of community service to ethnic and cultural minorities, women, low- and moderate-income families, elders, youths, gay people, small businesses, workers, the disabled, and government policy-makers.
I support neighborhood preservation, affordable housing measures (including rent control), jobs and job training for San Franciscans, comparable worth, and environmental safeguards.
I am a parent and San Francisco homeowner.

JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS
My address is 1203 Clayton Street
My occupation is Executor (Probate Attorney)
My qualifications for office are: This is not New York. My grandfather worked for this city for thirty-six years; helping to make San Francisco the greatest place on earth in which to live. Now our city bus system has to go hat in hand to Los Angeles to borrow buses. The quality of care at our general hospital has come under extreme question. The city of love, tolerance, and understanding is becoming more and more divided by every hate on earth. I, as a fourth generation San Franciscan, call upon you to join us natives in the fight to keep San Francisco San Francisco.

The Sponsors for Joseph J. Phillips are:
Margaret Moskowitz Berzin, 2201 Lake St., Retired
Ernest Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
Amelia Sheehan, 436-27th Ave., Homemaker
Salvador Garza, 793 Brunswick St., Businessman
Gerald E. Gallagher, 2282-34th Ave., Retired
Jean M. McDermott, 325-9th Ave., Tax Preparer
A. John Shimmel, 19 Midgiefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Juanita G Cardinelli, 1215-18th St., Retired
Peter G. Economou, 2040 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Laur Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Volunteer for Handicapped
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Consuelo G. Macdonald, 801-44th Ave., Retired
Roger Boschetti, 20 Carnelian St., Television Producer
Jody S. Hirota, 571-19th Ave., Dental Hygienist
Maurice C. Binian, 111 Willard North St., Salesman
Kelly Lyon, 435-25th Ave., Secretary
Ralph A. Barsi, 1236 Athens St., Retired Teamster
Laura B. Campbell, 1275-32nd Ave., NOW
William E. Bayers, Jr, 3232 Geary Blvd, Printer
Pearle Wong, 1535 Shrader St., Housewife
Sophia E. Conley, 2845 Cabrillo St., Teacher
Jimmy Starr, 23 Boardman Pl., Lawyer
Hannah Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
John L. Santiago, 150 Woodland Ave., Retired
Walter J. Murphy, 767 Corbett Ave., Retired
Carl H. Hoppe, 100 Hamilton St., Retired
Jack I. Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
Sam Keksteine, 84 Lopez Ave., Self Employed
Helen Marie Sheehan, 875-38th Ave., Housewife

Pat Norman

Priscilla Alexander, 745 Haight St., Feminist Activist
Zohn F. Artman, 141 Albion St., Media Consultant
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Executive Director, SF Renaissance
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing Manager
Diana Christensen, 56 Sutter St., Executive Director, CUAV
Dennis M. Collins, 145-27th St., Political Consultant
Greg Day, 2260 Market St., Youth Services Director
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Attorney/Teacher
Walter R. Ems, 116 Eureka St., Retired
Lawrence V. Espinette, 766 Geneva Ave., Confidential Secretary
Roma Guy, 383 Missouri St., Co-Director, The Women’s Foundation
Kenneth W. Jones, 600 Fillmore St., Office Manager; SF AIDS Foundation
Linda Jupiter, 2768-22nd St., Book Production Manager
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Senior Services Administration
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired Police Commissioner
Connie O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant, S.F. Sheriff’s Department
Juanita Owens, 371 Colderie St., Educator/Administrator
Thish A. Pearlman, 646 Duboce Ave., Writer/Photographer
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Political Activist
Sal Rosselli, 849 Lexington St., Labor Union Business Representative
Marguerite Rubenstein, 46 Stillings Ave., Therapist
Stephen H. Walters, 1223 Diamond St., Fundraiser

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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LOUISE RENNE

My address is 3725 Jackson Street
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
My age is 47

My qualifications for office are: As Finance Committee chairperson I have protected vital services while cutting wasteful expenditures. Sound policies have been implemented. San Francisco is on solid financial footing.

At the same time I played a leadership role in legislation affecting the environment, health care, Muni, the arts, indeed all San Franciscans (including our seniors and children).

My prior experience includes Deputy Attorney General, Criminal and Environmental Units; argued cases in Supreme Court; President, California Women Lawyers.

As an effective Supervisor, I pledge to continue my hard work, to act responsibly and compassionately, and to speak honestly on the critical issues affecting all San Franciscans.

Louise Renne

The sponsors for Louise Renne are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman 16th District
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli St., Public Relations
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director—CYO—Urban Development
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Pres. Airport Commission
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Harry G. Britt, 783A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minster
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Thomas J. Cahill, 246-17th Ave., Chief of Police, Retired
Lily Cuneo, 3519 Jackson St., Housewife
Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President, Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Mattie J. Jackson, 324 Belvedere St., Vice President, ILGWU
Walter G. Jeste, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman/Commissioner
John S. Jennings, 2743 San Bruno Ave., Realtor (Ret.)
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director of ILWU
Joseph LeRoy, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
Leslie M. Lawrence, 2423 Broadway, Certified Public Accountant
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner and Attorney
Melvin D. Lee, 450-22nd Ave., Engineer (Commissioner, S.F. Redevelopment Agency)
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Cyril Magnin, One Nob Hill Cir., Philanthropist
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor, State of California
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco
Bob Ross, 4200-30th St., Newspaper Publisher
Sal Rosselli, 549 Lexington St., Business Representative
Thomas C. Scanlan, 631 Vicente St., Investment Advisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, SF Board of Supervisors
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CAROL RUTH SILVER

My address is 68 Ramona Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: Experience: Seven years a San Francisco Supervisor; twenty years a practicing attorney; mother of two.

—Responsiveness to neighborhoods:
My parking reform legislation will open up neighborhood parking spaces.
My fire and smoke detector legislation will make our whole City more safe.

—Advocate for fairness legislation:
—preserving sunlight in parks
—outlawing gay discrimination
—creating low and moderate income housing
—repairing City streets and buildings
—rent control
—protecting Chinatown merchants
—S.A.F.E. and Senior Escort Programs
—Neighborhood Arts Programs
—reducing smog
—preserving San Francisco Bay
—expanding Muni
—wheelchair accessibility
—more women and minorities receiving City contracts
—child care
I will continue to insist on fairness.

Carol Ruth Silver

The Sponsors for Carol Ruth Silver are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
George Agnos, 2131 Funston Ave., City Attorney
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., San Francisco Assemblyman
Richard D. Hong, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., San Francisco Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, 335 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., San Francisco Supervisor
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, President, Airport Commission
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Utilities Commissioner
Emmett D. Condon, 2506-21st Ave.
Yori Wada, 563-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Julie C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Tim M. Daynot, 645 Randolph St., Charity Media Specialist
Terrence E. Griffin, 839-41st Ave., Retired Teacher
Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired
Samuel Jordan, 4006-3rd St., Caterer
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Civil Engineer
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Arthur Goldberg
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Realtor
Sal Rosselli, 549 Lexington St., Union Business Representative
Jack Tujillo, 74 Ramona St., Word Processor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DAVID C. SMITH
My address is 2567 Alemany Blvd
My occupation is Administrator, Service Agency
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: I am a San Francisco State graduate in journalism, married, with a deep affection for this place. For seven years my wife and I have counseled families and individuals from every neighborhood in San Francisco—an investment and commitment to the future. Dealing with these problems has increased my awareness of this city’s growing preoccupation with rights and shrinking concern for responsibilities. The solution includes a return to basics, to strong family units, to solid values, to the worth of all human life. I will be a voice for those who feel excluded, especially exploited children and the disadvantaged.

David C. Smith

KEVIN STARR
My address is 445 Chestnut Street
My occupation is Businessman, Communicator, Professor
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Born in San Francisco, I relish the past, present and future of this great city. I know it from a variety of perspectives—as executive aide to Mayor Alioto, as City Librarian, as a newspaper columnist, as a professor, as a businessman, and as a person active in many civic causes. I now wish to bring my talents and experience to the Board of Supervisors. I believe I can be of unique service as the centrist advocate of this city as it looks to its future. That future, the well-being of each of us, will be my greatest concern.

Kevin Starr

The sponsors for David C. Smith are:
James Bailey, Sr., 422 Guerrero St., Minister
Lillian P. Bailey, 422 Guerrero St., Housewife
Janis Ann Belt, 195 Sadora St., Secretary
Jeffrey Belt, 195 Sadora St., Photographer
Robert R. Carlson, 337 Baden St., Radio Producer
Victoria A. Carlyle, 1808 Octavia St., Political Analyst
John William Castro, 3 Plymouth St., Mover
John Frederick Decker, 1090 Eddy St., Designer
Frances Edwards, 2554 Alemany Blvd., Housewife
Daisy Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., Homemaker
David Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., High School President
James W. Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Police Officer
Jean Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Housewife
James L. Higgs, 270 Juanaita Way, Pastor
Margaret M. Lee, 730-12th Ave., Secretary
Mark W. Lee, 881 Silver Ave., President, Simpson College
Arvid Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Norma Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Secretary
Philip Litton, 3340 San Bruno Ave., Student
John A. McGeehan, 1230 LaPlaya St., Military, U.S. Army
Charles A. McGuiggan, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
J. Thad McKinney, 766 Kansas St., Station Manager
Marilyn G. Miller, 518 Dewey Blvd., Secretary
Chris Montgomery, 518 Dewey Blvd., Church Worker
Lawrence S. Pong, 244 Arch St., Environmental Health Inspector
James Douglas Robinson, 1319-7th Ave., Moving Company Manager
James W. Robinson, 518 Dewey Blvd., Executive Director of a Christian Service Organization
Conrad R. Sanchez, 1808 Octavia St., Restaurateur
Constance B. Steinbach, 180 Lippard Ave., Homemaker

The sponsors for Kevin Starr are:
Richard B. Allen, 2111 Franklin St., Merchant
Lynn A. Altshuler, 1490 Sacramento St., Attorney
Thomas E. Anderson, 236 Moncada Way, Clergyman
Michael Berwick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Job Training Director
Gino Biradelli, 700 Columbus Ave., Restaurateur
Sam Camhi, 265 San Anselmo Ave., Insurance Estate Planner
Frank J. Caufield, 1034 Chestnut St., Venture Capital Investor
Vyvet L. Chu, 1282 Vallejo St., Asian Art Commissioner
Elizabeth A. Cooley, 2520 Scott St., Legal Assistant
Paul Denning, 2165 California St., Investment Banker
Martin Eng, 665 Pine St., County Central Committee Member
James W. Haas, 163 Prospect Ave., Attorney
Patrick E. Hallinan, 117-27th Ave., Attorney
Walter E. Hoadley, 999 Green St., Economist
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Allan S. Johnson, 165 Prospect Ave., Consultant
Dorwin Buck Jones, 245 Northport St., Gerontologist; Director, Meals on Wheels
Harold K. Lipset, 2509 Pacific Ave., Private Investigator
Frances A. Lopez, 1474 Sacramento St., Paralegal
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Editor
John Maher, 795-8th Ave., Executive
Roxanne Mankin, 2312 Pacific Ave., Investment Real Estate
Michael Marston, 3375 Jackson St., Real Estate and Development Consultant
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave., Asst. Business Manager, Local #38
John N. Rosekrans, Jr., 2840 Broadway , Businessman, Toy Manufacturer
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Businessman
Michael Strumsky, 2266 Bay St., Construction Executive
Brooks Walker, Jr., 2930 Broadway, Business Executive
Suzan Yee, 632-6th Ave., Attorney

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

JOHN E. WAHL
My address is 118C Connecticut Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have a 20 year record of voluntary, unpaid public service to San Francisco. I have worked with all levels of City government, with people in all parts of the City. Examples of my public service include being a Judge Pro Tem of the San Francisco Municipal Court, 9 years of service on the Board of the San Francisco Council of Churches, service on the Pride Foundation Board, and service to veterans.
I am dedicated to ensuring affordable places to live, a responsible and unprejudiced police department, decent jobs, and dependable transportation.
I am independent of special interest club politics.

John E. Wahl

The sponsors for John F. Wahl are:
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, Community College Board
Carole W. Marks, 55 Jordan Ave., Economist and Civic Leader
James E. Sandmire, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
E. Patricia (Pat) Lucey, 69 Huntington Dr., Attorney
Benjamin L. Marcus, 84 Winfield St., Rabbi and Chaplain
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Walter W. Grumm, 3126-22nd St., Clergyperson
Ann Marie Day, 136 Delmar St., Retired Social Worker
Cleve Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Aide
Paul S. Yein, 342-8th Ave., Real Estate Agent
Hank Wilson, 1651 Market St., Hotel Operator
Fred L. Kufandor, 115 San Áleco, Attorney
Jean Wall Burgess, 421 Moraga Ave., Lawyer
Gary E. Myerscough, 156 Sproule Ln., Education Administrator
Paula F. Lichtenberg, 925 Jones St., Paralegal
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author, Retired Publisher
Jere G. Guerra, 85 Fortuny St., Retailer
Cleve B. Vaughn, Jr., M.D. 2170 Hayes St., Physician
Foster W. Weeks, 1910 Greenwich St., Advertising Consultant
Shirley Kaiser, 806-33rd Ave., Teacher
Robert W. Shore, 146 Guerrero St., Businessman
Rosa M. Kwong, 512 Van Ness Ave., Law Student
Charlene Yamato, 416 Font Blvd., Secretary
Jeanne Sibley, 75 Woodhaven Ct., Classroom Teacher
Alan Thompson Smith, 190 Palo Alto Ave., Small Business Owner
William Earl Andrews, 4130 Army St., Taxi Driver
Larry E. Hughes, 87 Fortuna St., Paralegal/Consultant
Julita V. DeChavez, 1591-45th Ave., Deputy County Clerk

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN
My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is Staff-writer for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 58
My qualifications for office are: My program:
Courts, cops and strike-breaking injunctions; two-gate, two-tiered, union-busting tactics, are helping employers depress living standards. Escalating health, housing and food costs are forcing working people—especially Blacks and Latinos—out of San Francisco. Corporate condos and highrises replace workers' residences.

Door-key children of working parents, denied child-care, are left to roam the streets. Abortion clinics are under siege.

Only united labor—employed, unemployed, black, white—can change this condition. An independent labor party, based on the unions, must be built to replace the callous politicians of the two ruling capitalist parties.

Jobs not war!

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:
Alan A Benjamin, 2783-20th St., Editor, Socialist Action
Paul Colvin, 558-36th Ave., Printer
Nancy G. Einoor, 613 Central Ave., Teacher
Ralph P. Forsyth, 77 Cerdzo St., Teacher
May May Gong, 25 Bessie St., Power Plant Operator
Nancy L. Gruber, 921 Alvarado St., Editor
Mildie B. Gonzalez, 2543-32nd Ave., Student
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Longshoreman
Ruth Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Office Worker
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297-18th St., Retail Clerk
William G. Leumer, 535 Day St., Mechanic
Ann Menashe, 2149-48th Ave., Feminist Attorney
Linda J. Ray, 3740-25th St., Registered Nurse
Ann A. Robertson, 535 Day St., Professor
Joseph M. Ryan, 25 Bessie St., Machinist
Karen A. Schiere, 3575-19th St., Sales Clerk
Michael William Schreiber, 3593 Mission St., Muni Driver
Carole Seligman, 245 Whitney St., Muni Bus Driver
Kathryn Setian, 1364-16th Ave., Engineer
Margery Jean VanDerslice, 1540-20th St., Registered Nurse
Christine Vaughn, 1255 Polk St., Poster or Clerk
David Walters, 2543-32nd Ave., Power Plant Operator
Bonnie Weinstein, 1716 Revere Ave., Student
Deborah Weinstein, 1830 Church St., Unemployed Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 489-27th St., Painter

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

DAVE WHARTON

My address is 5031 Diamond Heights Blvd.
My occupation is Community Service Attorney
My age is 44


It’s time for housing expansion, for transit, traffic, parking overhaul. Time for better City services, especially for seniors and youth. Time to strengthen economy, create jobs, control taxes. Time for neighborhood revitalization, parking relief. Time for human rights advancement, efficient and humane police services. Experiment with Board meetings in neighborhoods.

It’s time for goals, results, citizen participation. San Francisco is world class city, small town; lose either, be neither. I build bridges, not barriers. Join our common sense coalition.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:

Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Libby Senebecb, 200 St Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Attorney/Rent Board Commissioner
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Russell Flynn, 2815 Pacific Ave., Real Estate/Rent Board Commissioner
Charles B. Renfrew, 791-14th Ave., Attorney/Former Federal Judge
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Hotel/Real Estate Executive
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Alicia Wang, 1418 Leavenworth St., Educational Specialist
Mortimer Fleischacker, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Investor
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
Diane C. Kefauver, 1726 Great Highway, Consultant
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Union President/Retired
Jose Gomez, 59 Grandview Ave., Legal Services/Executive Director
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
John L. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Insurance/Savings and Loan Chairman
Phyllis Kern, 306 Arbor St., Labor Union Secretary
Russell I. Kassman, 2454 Bush St., Businessman
Laura E. McBride, 925 Cole St., Typographer
George M. Raya, 90 Verna Ctl., City Employee
Richard B. Morton, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Development Executive

Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Agent
Lawrence A. Wilson, 335-A Pierce St., Attorney—Community Volunteer
Deborah R. Pines, 4248-20th St., Financial Consultant
John T. McAlister, Jr, 959 Green St., Businessman
Bobbie Griffith, 50 Leland Ave., District Attorney Investigator
Edith Wellin, 165-A Alpine Ter., Teacher

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

DICK CERBATOS
My address is 471 Hoffman Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have always been deeply interested in the education of youth. Before my appointment to the Board of Education two years ago, I served twenty years on Citizens' Advisory and PTA committees focusing on education. As an engineer-business-owner, I also bring professional skills to the Board.
As a first generation American, I am sympathetic to minority children's problems, and aware that public education is the golden gateway to opportunity and success.
I intend to continue pressing for higher test scores, improved discipline and morale, less truancy, and an increase in college admissions.
I am committed to excellence in education.

A. Richard Cerbatis

The sponsors for Dick Cerbatos are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Wille L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Lawyer
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney at Law
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director
Judy Dellamonica, 3323 Taraval St., President, San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President-Personnel Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Eugene S. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Physician
Thomas, E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Ralph F. Hurtado, 65 Newburg St., Executive Director
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Labor-Vice President, ILGWU
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir. ILWU
Mrya G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Bette Wallace Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Cir., Homemaker
Vendel Nelder, 190 Casitas Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Yuri Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, S.F. Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSEN
My address is 29 Oliver Street
My occupation is Transit Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I was born and raised in San Francisco, graduating from Balboa High.
For the past 7 years I have been active in the school district having been elected to 2 terms on the District Advisory Committee, 4 years as the chairperson of the Pelton Academic Middle School Parent's Group, and 5 years on the site advisory council at Pelton.
I am married and have 2 children attending Commodore Sloat Elementary School.
I believe there is much work needed to provide the quality education our children need to prepare them for a highly technical society of computers and robotics.

Chris Christenson

The sponsors for Christopher Christenson are:
Eesse L. Webb, 186 Maddux Ave., Intake & Referral Specialist
Raymond Tunstall, 315 John Muir Dr., Deputy Sheriff
Francie Smyth, 1709-16th Ave., Deputy Sheriff
Harry E. Jensen, III, 74 Delmonte St., Electrical Transit Manager
Joe W. Turner, 1274 Palou Ave., Janitor Supervisor II
Martin Larkin, 4733 Lincoln Way, Paint Supervisor
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Mini Supervisor II
Joseph Dela Rosa, 50 Oliver St., Seaman
Precious Moore, 2046 Thomas Ave., Home Health Aide
Liana Sand Dune Kastina, 524 Clipper St., Clerk Typist
William Satchell, 500 Francisco St., Transit Car Cleaner
Roy W. Haver, 576 Lisbon St., Marble Shopman
Guadalupe Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Jeanie L. Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Grocery Clerk
Roosevelt Lancaster, 170 Ledyard St., Transit Car Cleaner
Lena M. Quintana, 3321 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Alfred Lent, 1475 Church St., Electrical Mechanic
George Williams, Sr., 335 Hearst Ave., Retired
Beatrice L. Dunbar, 430 Thornton Ave., Retired
Victor Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Driver
Gabriela, W. Wilkerson, 1347-15th Ave., Cashier
LIBBY DENEBEIM
My address is 200 St. Francis Blvd.
My occupation is Incumbent School Board Member
My qualifications for office are: Four years ago you elected me to the school board. I am deeply grateful.
I have worked hard. Student achievement scores improved, enrollment stabilized. We strengthened significantly special programs and alternative schools.
There remains much work to do. As a mother of six public school educated children, former teacher and experienced school board member, I know how our schools should work.
Many children today will finish school in the 21st Century. For all our children we must plan for the future, reaffirm our commitment to excellence, use school dollars prudently and ensure the momentum for improvement in our schools continues.

Libby Denebeim

The sponsors for Libby Denebeim are:
Robert S. Denebeim, 200 St Francis Blvd., Businessman
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Sala Burton, 8 Staat Blvd., Congresswoman
William K. Cobenzl, 50-10th Ave., Attorney
Patricia F. Costello, 2838 Green St., Community Leader
Cariota T. del Portillo, 48 Berkeley Way, Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Zuretti L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA Volunteer
Richard D. Honigst, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Cynthia Brown Kelly, 460 Magellan St., Homemaker
Myra G. Kopf, 1949-12th Ave., Board of Education Member
Ruth Asawa Laniere, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan St., Lt. Governor
Peter Mezy, 3382 Clay St., Attorney/Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., Mental Health Director
John L. Molinar, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder, 150 Cistus Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
Philip Bruce Ralat, 962 Clayton St., SF Open Space Committee Member
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor/Gay Leader
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher/President, SF Federation of Teachers
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Pamela Ponzio Waller, 649 San Jose Ave., Contract Compliance Representative
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Malcolm S.M. Watts, 27 Seacull Ave., Physician

GEORGE DYKSTRA
My address is 949 Filbert Street
My occupation is Community Services Director
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am trained in government finance and Citizen Participation decision making. Long community involvement includes director, Educational Services, Executive Board of Golden Gate Child Development, Saint Mary's Hospital Board and Yick Wo Elementary Parent's Committee. My education includes a B.A., emphasizing Education and U.S.C. graduate school.
I am practical, experienced and positive. I expect more from students, parents and teachers. I promise fiscal responsibility. I respect and support parent participation, teacher professionalism and every student's right to learn in well-equipped, orderly schools. Opportunity, Technology and Basics.

Vote for me! I will keep children in the picture.

George Dykstra

The sponsors for George Dykstra are:
Lisa Bardaro, M.D., 880 Sloat Blvd., Physician
Millicent E. Buxton, 80 Parnassus Ave., Educator
Robert T. Corrado, 18 Miranda Ave., Administrator
Teresa M. D'Auray, 75 Heather St., Environmental Fund Raising
Kathleen DePaloa, 949 Filbert St., Psychologist
Kathleen Dykstra, 949 Filbert St., Legal Administrator
Linda J. Gaudreau, 558-26th Ave., Director of Medical Records
Terense Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Attorney-at-Law
Ann K. Howell-Isom, 904 Cortland Ave., Volunteer Coordinator
D. S. Inaba, 44 Escondido Ave., Associate Professor
Martha Anne Jessup, 2562 Diamond St., Educator
Deborah L. Keller, 1466-41 Ave., Student
Katherine Lambert, 65 Winfield St., Women's Services Consultant
Mim Londry, 1040 Cole St., Student
Nick Lederer, 79 Mitzah St., Executive Director, Senior Services
Dr. Thomas S. McCoy, 1446 Clay St., Professor
Tim P. Mess, M.D. 55 Lundys Lane, AIDS Clinician-Researcher
Susan L. Mok, 1332-38th Ave., Acupuncturist
Marcia Quackenbush, 1690-27th Ave., Social Worker
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director
CAHEED
Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Director of Health
Kenneth M. Sims, 1454 Palou Ave., Associate Director Child Development Center
David E. Smith, 80 Parnassus Ave., Physician
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Monticello St., Attorney
Michael Stepanian, 2109 Baker St., Attorney
Harvey W. Q. Tse, 70 Lomita Ave., Businessman
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilirius, Methodist Minister
E. Leif Zerkin, 1526-26th Ave., Editor

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

My address is 665 Pine Street
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant

My qualifications for office are: Twelve years of community and civic service.

Issues
Eng supports:
• Our children’s inherent right for education.
• Regain respect for our teachers.
• Strict measures to halt school violence. Stop the sale and use of street drugs.
• Higher standards for teachers and students.
• Encourage teachers and parents participation within the Board.
• Merit pay to outstanding teachers.

Maximize income: Lease surplus school properties. End mismanagement by incompetent Board members.

Eng opposes:
• Current programs teaching alternative lifestyle to our precious children. A violation of the First Amendment.
• Board members extravagant dinner meetings with liquor paid for by taxpayers. A blatant violation of the law.

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:

John Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Real Estate Broker, Former Supervisor
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Commissioner, Contractors State License Board, State of California
Lee S. Dolsen, 1755 Beach St., Professor, Former Supervisor
Dr. John B. Ta, 2 Denslow Dr., Education Commissioner
Melvin M. Bell, 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Terr., Landmark Preservation Board
Steven J. Doli, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
C. Mackey E. Salazar, 183 San Benito Way, City Planning Commissioner
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli St., Retired
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, State Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Anna Kyle Pauzewang, 30 Cunningham Pl., Legal Assistant
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Vice President, District One Political Action
Kevin G. Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Property Consultant
John S. Tang, M.D., 2184 Funston Ave., Physician
Timothy A. Toffa, 570 Ashbury St., Attorney
Jung Roy Gee, 665 Pine St., Investor, Education Researcher
William Bernstein, 1000 Franklin St., Attorney
Robert F. Varni, 10 Miller Pl., Chairman-Police Data Systems
Frank S. Yee, 338 Los Palamos Dr., Real Estate Finance; Teacher
Rev. Charles A. McHenny, 1350 Lawton St., Congregational
William Jack Chaw, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney at Law
F. Theodore Kitt, 2801 Broadway, Lawyer
Robbie Tom, 26 Annapolis Ter., V.P.-Branch Manager, S & L
Velma Petersille, 665 Pine St., Teacher
Ed Pond, 16-38th Ave., Insurance broker/Accountant
S.M. Saroyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Business Enterprises/Lawyer
Frank N. Alioto, 2898 Vallejo St., Restaurant Owner
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., 444 Corbett Ave., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Assn.

EUGENE S. HOPP, M.D.

My address is 601 Van Ness Avenue, Opera Plaza
My occupation is Physician

My qualifications for office are: For the past thirteen years I have served on the Board of Education as an independent voice committed to the goal of educating all our children to their fullest potential. The current stress on teaching the basics must continue, combined with offerings of high technology and vocational courses designed to prepare our diverse student population for a changing future. I stand for an integrated educational program and welcome parents and the public to assist me in this challenge.

"Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Eugene S. Hopp are:

Molly M. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Telecommunications Executive
Dianne Feinstein, 3020 Lyon St., Mayor
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Attorney
Bill Maher, 69 Elbie St., Supervisor
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, Vice President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr, 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Police Commissioner
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Police Commissioner
Alan S. Wong 1280 Ellis St., Commissioner, Community College
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member S F Community College
John F. Crowley, 87 Los Palamos Dr., Labor Official
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Amos J. Castro, 1401 California St., Physician
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Civil Rights Administrator
Harry Polland, 637 Powell St., Economist
Saul Madfes, 75 Country Club Dr., Retired, School Admin.
Jo Birabamu, 1750 Taylor St., Housewife
Anita H. Sanchez, 44 Restani Way, Social Worker
Chadwick C. Ertola, 660 Greenwich St., Attorney
Naomi Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Businesswoman
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
Raye G. Richardson, 1714 Fillmore St., Assoc. Professor
Max L. Christensen, 2 Heather Ave., Clergyman
Larry Mazzaola, 3060-24th Ave, Asst Business Mgr
Leo J. Murphy, Sr., 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Lane E. De Lara, 2 Lenox Way, Educational Consultant
Gregory C. Lintner, 2560 Webster St., Realtor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
TERRY HUGUNIN

My address is 1824 Noriega Street
My occupation is Consultant
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: Those of us who were teenagers during President Kennedy's Appolo Space Program thought there was nothing we and our nation might not accomplish: "We're going to the moon in ten years!" Thanks to outfits like the National Education Association, the science oriented New Frontiers of the 60's have given way to the "other-directedness" of the Aquarian Age. Their goal: form a society of androgynous pacifists—study their literature. Mine is to restore the problem-solving orientation appropriate to Judeo-Christian culture. Help me mobilize our schools to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative and overcome the nuclear war threat.

Terry Hugunin

The sponsors for Terry Hugunin are:

Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Letida Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elora Hardy, 143 Paraliones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcanzo, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
ClEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcela K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Stainniec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitsis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

JAMES LEGARE

My address is 254 Oak Street
My occupation is Motor Truck Operator
My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I am committed to installing a sound educational program in our schools as the basis for getting our country and economy moving again—in the American tradition. We need to develop young minds through a program of classical education and to protect them by wiping out drugs in the schools and in the nation.

I propose to reform the school system along these lines:

1) Classical geometry and physics, as typified by Plato, Archimedes, Cusa Kepler, and Leibniz
2) Classical poetry, music, and drama, exemplified by Homer, Aeschylus, Dante, Shakespeare, Schiller, Bach, and Beethoven

James Legare

The sponsors for James Legare are:

Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Letida Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elora Hardy, 143 Paraliones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
Micaela M. Lezcanzo, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
ClEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Nick Pace, 130 Campbell Ave., Railroad Employee
Sandra Parks, 16 Garces St., Railroad Employee
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Stainniec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
Nicholas E. Vallego, 875 Cayuga Ave., Electrician
John Vozaitsis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JO ANNE MILLER

My address is 1920 Quint Street  
My occupation is Parent and Teacher  
My qualifications for office are: I am the mother of two  
children in San Francisco Public Schools. I believe in  
the Public School System; and have a personal interest  
in its quality and effectiveness. I am a teacher of  
the blind. I am President of the Glen Park School Site  
Advisory Committee, and hold other elected civic  
ofices.  

The lack of parent representation on the School Board  
has contributed to a lack of parent and citizen involve-  
ment, a lack of long-term planning and vision in school  
administration, and a failure to commit the School Dis-  
trict to a plan and goal of excellence for all children.  

JoAnne Miller

BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones Street  
My occupation is Transportation Analyst  
My qualifications for office are: I believe I have provided  
outstanding leadership during my eight years on the San  
Francisco Board of Education. This is evidenced by the  
fact that test scores have improved and new programs  
have attracted students back from private schools. 

As an active parent, I know San Francisco's schools  
first-hand. I have worked conscientiously for our chil-  
dren's future. I have the vision and I have gained the  
practical skills necessary to continue building our school  
district into one of the best large urban districts in the  
nation.  

Benjamin Tom

The sponsors for JoAnne Miller are:

Julie C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist  
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of  
San Francisco  
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress  
Angel D. Contreras, 1461 Alabama St., Administrator of  
Headstart  
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Denning St., President, San Francisco NOW  
Leila Fries, 330-35th Ave., Community Organizer  
Bob Garry, 2578 Great Highway, San Francisco Police Officer  
Louise Harvey, 673 Fulton St., Educational Consultant  
Marilee Hearn, 3030 Turk Blvd., Teacher  
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco  
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney Investigator  
Darro Inouye, 251 Gates St., Attorney  
Clave Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Assistant  
LeRoy King, 75 Santa Llana, Reg. Dir., ILWU  
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member  
Jean E. Kortum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist  
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor  
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member of Board of Supervisors  
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Business Executive  
Hugh B. Miller, 355 Roosevelt Way, Attorney  
John L. Molinari, 50-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors  
Constance O'Conner, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff  
James E. O'Connor, 72 Mersed Ave., Taxi Cab Owner  
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingersol Ave., Executive Director,  
CAHEED, Inc.  
Jerry Ringerman, 485 Crestmont Dr., Executive Director, San  
Francisco Jewish Community Center  
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator  
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE  
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors  
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., President, AAFUM

The sponsors for Ben Tom are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor  
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor  
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Supervisor  
Carol Ruth Silver, 69 Ramona St., Supervisor, San Francisco  
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors  
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commission  
William K. Cobbietz, 30-5th Ave., Attorney  
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner  
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director, CYO  
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner  
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent  
Ben L. Hom, 1 Villa Ter., Banker, Executive  
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker, College Community  
Board Member  
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director, Pre-Trial  
Diversion Project  
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor, City and County  
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress  
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor  
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner  
Myra G. Kropf, 1940-12th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education  
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member  
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado way, Minister  
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board  
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Board Member School  
Administrator  
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney  
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Business Representative  
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of  
San Francisco  
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor  
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College  
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco  
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman, 16th District

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Candidates for College Board

ERNEST "CHUCK" AYALA
My address is 4402-20th Street
My occupation is Youth Director, CYO-Urban Development Division
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan, South of Market neighborhood. Attended public and parochial schools, including City and Lone Mountain Colleges. My involvement in community development and public service is with youth in Education, Employment and Delinquency Prevention, in addition to developing and administering Senior Citizens and Veterans Programs. Business management background in labor, insurance and real estate provides me with a balanced approach to fiscal and administrative objectives of the Community College District. My continued goal for the Community College District is to retain its open door policy and remain responsive to the educational and vocational needs of the people.

Ernest Chuck Ayala

The sponsors for Ernest "Chuck" Ayala are:
Reginald Y. Alexander, 182 Middlefield Dr., Vice Chancellor, Certified
Bernice E. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Homemaker
Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College District
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, S.F. Community College Board
Vincent J. Callan, 4038 19th St., Retired
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot St., House Wife
Marjorie M Colvin, 1835 Franklin St. #1403, Housewife
Peter J. Fatooh, 30 Grand View Ave., Businessman
William L. Fazio, 110 Inverness Dr., Asst District Attorney
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley St., Management Consultant
Al Graf, 859 Bryant St., Businessman
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonerock Dr., Contractor
Marcel Kapulica, 2470 22nd Ave., Dental Laboratory-Owner
Louis E. Lagger, 4001 21st St., District Manager, Packing Co.
Dorothy J. Letebetich, 15 Fiorentine St., Retired
Ernestine A. McGoldrick, 4442 20th St., School Clerk/Housewife
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., 1789 Eucalyptus St., State Assemblyman-
Retired
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board

AMOS CLEOPHILUS BROWN
My address is 111 Lunado Way
My occupation is Clergyman
My age is 43
My qualifications for office are: I hold the B.A., M.Div. and D.D. degrees. 16 years of public service on boards of education throughout the U.S. more than qualifies me for the position.

My services on the Board of Governors since 1982 reflect that I am competent and able to work with a team of governors to ensure the delivery of a quality education system for all persons in our community who desire training for marketable skills. Community College also must serve the needs of those who for various reasons have not had the opportunity of going to other institutions of higher learning for training.

Amos C. Brown

The sponsors for Amos C. Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Member, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, Community College Board
Priscilla A. Dennard, 210 Broad St., Secretary
James Gordon Emerson, Jr., 175 Beaumont St., Clergyman
Mayor Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Dr. Howard S. Floyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Zelma R. Harrison, 1957 Hayes St., Bookkeeper
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Grandel A. Jackson, 257 Kennington Way, Retired
Clifton R. Jeffers, 1883 14th Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor
John L. Molinar, 30 16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Lauraret Newkirk, 554 Brussels St., System Support Librarian
Louise H. Renn, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Naomi Slines, 755 Page St., Fiscal Clerk
Rabbi Malcolm M. Sparer, 1059 Clement St., Rabbi
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillitarus St., Minister
Hannibal A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergyman
Tomothy R. Wolford, 91 Sanger St., President, College Board
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PATRICK C. FITZGERALD
My address is 128 Detroit Street
My occupation is San Francisco County Central Committeeeman, 16th Assembly District.
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: • Am married, father of three children and a homeowner
• Graduated: St. Ignatius College Prep. and City College of San Francisco
• Elected San Francisco County Central Committeeeman (since 1970)
• California State Central Committeeeman (since 1978)
• Attended San Francisco 1984 National Presidential Convention for Mondale-Ferrero
• Served on San Francisco City Government CATV Task Force Educational Access Committee
• Instrumental in adoption of San Francisco City College Labor Studies Program
• Great Nephew of former San Francisco County Supervisor Tom O’Dowd
• Past Secretary San Francisco County Central Committee
• Strong opponent 1983 Feinstein Recall
• Successfully fought peripheral canal
• Support Propositions: 33 (disabled homeowners) and 40 (political campaign reform).

The sponsors for Patrick C. Fitzgerald are:
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official
John J. Moylan, 2065-24th Ave., Labor Leader
Terence Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Marion L. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Social Worker
Patricia K. Mooser, 1762-17th Ave., Tax Consultant/Bookkeeper
Josephine Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Central Committeeeman
Clara Stein, 2330 Sloat Blvd., Cashier
Brian J. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Real Estate Broker
Sue T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., State Central Committeeeman
Mildred K. Bird, 1762-17th Ave., Retired
Mary Ann Cowen, 134 Detroit St., Secretary
Charles T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Retired
Emily B. Shimmon, 19 Midfield St., Housewife
Thomas P. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Displayman
Esther F. Zlott, 75 Midfield St., Retired
Peter B. Paragas, 1923 San Jose Ave., Engineering Graduate
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Adriano Biagiotti, 131 Detroit St., Retired
A. Lee Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, City College Graduate
Kenneth J. Lukas, 215 Detroit St., Carpenter
Lloyd A. Quain, 96 Staples St., Retired
Louise E. Quain, 96 Staples St., Retired
William T. Bray, 207 San Mateo Ave., Gatemate
Mary B. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Homemaker
Lisa L. Kloebucar, 135 San Felipe Way, County Central Committeeeman
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 1 28 Detroit St., Housewife
Jim Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Arlo H. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney

DEAN GOODMAN
My address is 825 Geary Street #703
My occupation is Retired Teacher/Actor
My age is 64
My qualifications for office are: Thirty years of teaching, an educator’s concern for quality instruction, and a citizen’s awareness of the need for budget control. As the first fulltime president of the Community College Federation of Teachers, Local 2121 and as a former staff member of the District I know well the policies and procedures which form the structure of the Community College and the College Centers.
If elected, I will insist on fair hiring practices, and as a member of that most diverse of all groups, our Senior Citizens, I will support college services for all adults regardless of individual differences.

The sponsors for Dean Goodman are:
Priscilla Alden, 1677 Bush St., #8, Actress
Ugo Baldassari, 988 Dolores St., Theatre Director
James E. Ballard, 2 Arbor St., Teacher
Sheldon I Balman, 5 Perego Ter., Attorney
Laurent R. Broussal, 855 Quintara St., Administrator, Community College
Kimo Cochran, 1330 Bush St., Bar Owner
Donald G. Climent, 117 Ord St., Refugee Resettlement Counselor
Lauri Fried-Lee, 435 19th Ave., Community College Instructor
William Gundel, 1415 Franklin St., Credit Adjuster
Frances T. Hughes, 2649 Polk St., Legal Secretary
Donna Ilyin, 76 6th Ave., Counselor
Lynda Bergren Kalb, 24 Magnolia St., Singer/Actress
Michael J. Mandel, 12 Marne St., Attorney
Donnalld J. Miller, 26 Leo St., Furniture Manufacturer
Jay Moran, 1667 Page St., Business Representative
Allen Nomura, 177 Bocana St., Theatrical Photographer
Judy Winn-Bell Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Teacher/Editor
Roger E. W-B Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Publisher
Frank Reilly, 3415 Divisadero St., Advertising/Actor
James J. Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Rev. James E. Sandmire, 452 Buchanan St., Minister
Eve Stoddard, 180 Diamond St., Probate Administration
Daniel A. Sullivan, 1590 Sacramento St., Attorney
Doug Tranham, 701 Taylor St., Pianist
Sigrid Wurschmidt, 1142 DeHarto St., Actress
Samuel L. Zanze, 2581 25th Ave., Businessman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Candidates for College Board

ANDRE F. PEHARGOU

My address is 3840 Fulton Street
My occupation is Civil Servant
My qualifications for office are: I have been a resident of San Francisco for 34 years. I am a graduate of California State University San Francisco; San Francisco City College, and Lowell High School.

Most taxpayers are not benefitting from the Community College System due to lack of information and lack of convenient locations.

As a Board member, I will advocate a strong academic curriculum; More neighborhood locations to facilitate Senior citizens and working taxpayers; Better utilization of present facilities, and a decrease in tuition fees for City residents.

If you want expanded services to help benefit you, give me your support on election day.

Andre F. Pehargou

The sponsors for Adre F. Pehargou are:
William Angelopoulou, 59 Prague St., Employed
Renee Boulay, 605 Arguello Blvd., Retired
Josephine Buchiott, 553 25th Ave., Retired
Andre Carrey, 487 2nd Ave., Retired
James Edward Coleman, 620 Banks St., Supervisor
Alice Curove, 1827 Balboa St., Part Time Office Worker
Robert S. Fiahavan, 151 Buchanan St., Operations Officer, S. F. Airport
Emma Garrigues, 2702 Anza St., Retired
Diana Hantman, 361 25th Ave., Teacher
Rose Hantman, 720 La Playa St., #307, Retired
Paulette Henderson, 798 Naples St., Retired
Paul Keplinger, 3832 Fulton St., Concierge
Anna Konor, 3315 Irving St., Retired
James Courtney Kovach, 1282 43rd Ave., Lithographer
Eva Lim, 3832 Fulton St., Asst. Paymistress
D. Martin, 87 Seward St., Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788-18th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor's degree in Psychology from the University of San Francisco; Master's in Education from Stanford University; Juris Doctorate from Hastings College of Law; a wife, mother, former teacher and counselor; and presently, Assistant District Attorney in San Francisco.

I have served diligently, always conscious of my responsibility to all the communities of San Francisco who gave me the highest number of votes four years ago. I strive to ensure that the Community College will continue providing quality education to all students, even during financial crises, without sacrificing student or faculty needs. As the only woman board member, I actively support women's issues.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
John Yehall Chinn, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guerrero St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member Board of Supervisors
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Univ of Calif Regent
John L. Molinaro, 20-16th Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Commissioner, Board of Education/School Administrator
Arlo E. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant SF Sheriff's Dept.
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member SF Community College Board
Madeleine H. Russell, 3778 Washington St., Investments
Susan J. Birman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Anne Belisle Dauly, 795 Geneva Blvd., Executive Director
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member SF Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Linda A. Post, 1846-13th St., Community Activist
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Incumbent SF Supervisor
Bette W. Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney's Investigator
Jeffrey K. Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 910 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Educator

My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer/Worker, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

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

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

Moy Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy Velasquez are:

Lilian Aldea, 231 Granada Ave., Teacher
Concepcion G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Teacher
Melandro Busto, 49 Capp St., Student
Victoriano G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Mechanic
Stasia Cagara, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Sales
Rosa T. Castaneda, 18 Guy Pl., Teacher’s Aide
Encarnacion P. Caspea, 931 Prague St., Teacher
Cheryl R. Conrad, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student
Theresa N. Fabro, 4186 Mission St., School Lunchroom Manager
Kenneth A. Guerra, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Technician
Odalia Jones, 1775 Newcomb Ave., Housekeeper
Felisa P. Misenas, 266 Brighton Ave., School Lunch Helper
Basil C. Nickerson, 336-6th St., Self Employed
Willie B. Nichols, 1231-5th Ave., Custodian
Jack Lee Posewash, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Production Manager
Margaret M. Powers, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Customer Service
Clarice D. Robinson, 2445 Harrison St., Teacher’s Aide
Encarnacion A. Ramos, 2700 Folsom St., Room Cleaner
Murdie Washington, 195 Highland St., Monitor
David A. Woodard, 397 Green St., Chef

DR. TIM WOLFRED

My address is 91 Sanchez Street
My occupation is Incumbent, President, San Francisco Community College Board

My qualifications for office are: As an incumbent, I am proud of a College Board that, with less dollars than it had four years ago, has kept all programs operating and has expanded services to San Franciscans most dependent on a healthy community college system for access to job skills training and a basic college education. Neighborhood college centers have moved into larger, renovated facilities. Vocational offerings in fields like computer technologies, nursing, and auto mechanics have been updated. Classes in language skills have been strengthened in immigrant communities. We are a Board dedicated to quality education open to all San Franciscans.

Dr. Tim Wolfred

The sponsors for Dr. Tim Wolfred are:

Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
Willie Brown, 1200 Gough St., Assembly Member
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembly Member
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff, City and County of San Francisco
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Alan Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Member, Community College Board
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Sedonia Wilson, 340 Darien Way, School Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., School Board Member
Libby Danekbahl, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member
Agrigino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave, School Board Member
Carlota T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner

Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Harold Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas St., Pastor, Glide Church
Bob Reas, 4200-20th St., Publisher
Sandy Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Thomas Peretti, 3787-16th St., Banker
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Official
Carole Migden, 563-28th St., Executive Director, Operation Concern

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PROPOSITION A

Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

YES 253
NO 254

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Port Commission operates the Port of San Francisco. When funds are needed for Port construction or improvements, the Commission may issue revenue bonds to raise funds. A majority of the voters must approve these bonds before they can be issued. The revenue bonds are then paid from Port revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance several improvements of Port property. These improvements include modernizing container handling facilities, upgrading various piers, constructing a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, and renovating certain other Port structures and property. The bonds would then be paid off from Port revenues.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance improvements of Port property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Port Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

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

Bond redemption $ 42,500,000
Bond interest 81,761,400
Total debt service requirement $124,261,400

“Based on a three year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning four years after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $4,462,000 to a maximum of $5,760,000 annually for twenty-seven years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Port revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Port sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Port. Analysis of projected resources available to the Port indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On July 30 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on a motion placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 51.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The revitalization of the Port of San Francisco will bring new jobs and new tax revenue to the City. A healthy port, with increased ship traffic, will bring millions each year to the San Francisco economy.

By delaying modernizations in the past, the Port of San Francisco lost the bulk of its maritime business to other Bay Area and West Coast cities. The same mistakes must not be made twice. We must allow the Port to use revenues to finance continued improvements.

Proposition A does not authorize any new taxes. Proposition A simply authorizes the Port to use revenues to finance improvements and expansion.

Proposition A will allow for the modernization of existing container cargo terminals on the southern waterfront. These improved facilities will retain current business and will bring new lines to San Francisco. The return of the shipping business will bring back long lost blue collar jobs to the waterfront as well as white collar jobs.

In addition, Proposition A will provide for expansion of the passenger facility, a new breakwater to protect the commercial fishing fleet, and improved rail access to the port. In all, Proposition A will upgrade and modernize San Francisco Port facilities so as to make them competitive with other ports across the Bay and throughout the West Coast.

The complete modernization effort will be done at no cost to the taxpayers. Instead, the Port of San Francisco’s income will be used to finance long-term revenue bonds.

The people of San Francisco deserve a first-rate port. We urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote YES on Proposition A.

As Mayor, I have worked hard to restore our port to its historic pre-eminence as a major gateway to the Far East.

Once again, major shipping lines are docking in San Francisco. Just recently, two of the largest container vessel operators, China Ocean Shipping Corporation and Columbus Lines, signed agreements to use this port.

Not only modern cargo carriers, but passenger liners as well are being drawn to San Francisco in a remarkable renaissance of maritime commerce.

But if there is to be a lasting renewal of our waterfront, the port must be competitive with other port cities anxiously contending for the burgeoning Pacific trade. The port, if it is to prosper, must modernize and enlarge its basic maritime facilities.

That’s the purpose of Proposition A.

Proposition A will make the Port of San Francisco truly and vigorously competitive. And it will not cost the taxpayers a penny.

Proposition A will authorize $42.5 million in revenue bonds for vital waterfront projects, including the conversion of Pier 80 into a modern, state-of-the-art container facility and the enlargement and modernization of cargo operations at Piers 94 and 96.

Additionally, Proposition A will provide funds for repairing the now deteriorating Jefferson Street Seawall and will match Federal dollars for construction of a much-needed breakwater to protect the City’s fishing fleet at Fisherman’s Wharf.

Proposition A also will finance expansion of the passenger terminal at Pier 35.

Proposition A is a prudent investment in the City’s future. And these bonds are payable only from port revenues—your taxes will not be increased.

More ships, with more cargo and more passengers, mean more jobs and greater economic vitality for our city.

Proposition A will make our port, once again, a strong and lasting competitor for the commerce of the Pacific Basin. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco needs a good, working port. Vote yes on Proposition A and help bring it about.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Citizens of San Francisco are worried about the deterioration of the port. Most of us can remember when the port was a thriving, bustling commercial enterprise, and the docks were maintained, clean, efficient, and busy.

But, the port has not adapted to container cargo, and may be losing the few shipping lines that it now serves. We must restructure the docks for active container shipping, and bring in railway lines to service the docks.

We have one of the few deep water ports in America, an essential for modern shipping. LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT BEING ONE OF THE BEST PORTS IN THE WEST AGAIN!

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Wendy Neider
President of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will permit the Port of San Francisco to issue bonds to finance needed construction and improvements. This would give the Port the same financing ability the Airport now has.

Through the issuance of revenue bonds, the Port would be able to undertake necessary improvements AT NO COST TO TAXPAYERS.

San Francisco deserves a modern, thriving port. Proposition A will help us build modern terminals, a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf which will help keep commercial fishermen in San Francisco, repair the seawall at Jefferson Street and expand our Passenger Terminal to handle increased cruise business that brings millions of dollars into our local economy.

Proposition A will give the Port of San Francisco the ability to make these kinds of improvements. Please join me in voting YES.

Sala Burton,
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A offers San Franciscans the opportunity to direct the future of the Port of San Francisco.

This measure will provide our Port with the key to the future.

We must keep pace with new developments, increase cargo and create new jobs. For every fifty new containers we move, 1.67 new jobs will be created.

This measure also includes funding for construction of the Fisherman's Wharf Breakwater, which is critically needed and long overdue.

Take part in the future of our Port. Join with me in voting YES on Proposition A.

Milton Marks,
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a waterfront city. We have a superb natural harbor, which is also one of the few really deep water harbors—vital for modern deep water cargo ships.

We have used our badly deteriorating and long unimproved pier facilities to their maximum efficiency. But times are changing. We must move NOW to keep pace with new developments, or risk enormous losses in cargo shipping, commercial fishing, and tourist trade.

It is ESSENTIAL that we adapt to container cargo that can be moved by train, truck, and ship.

Research has been done on what could give us the greatest increase in efficiency and profits for the very least amount of money. And the answer is: modernizing the South Terminal for adaptation to container cargo; providing rail access to the docks; protecting the commercial fishing fleet with a breakwater; and expanding passenger-handling facilities for cruise passenger tourists.

Prop A will provide these improvements RIGHT NOW. And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION
Arthur H. Coleman, President
James Rudden, Vice President
Gordon Lau, Member
Anne Halsted, Member
James Herman, Member

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PRESIDENTIAL GENERAL ELECTION—NOVEMBER 6, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
# VOTER SELECTION CARD

## CANDIDATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Congress Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Board (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTEAUSENTE

缺席選票申請表

Election Date ____________________

I hereby apply for an absent voter’s ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

請寄一份缺席選票給本人，以參加選舉

PRINTED NAME - LETRAS DE IMPRENTA - 正楷書寫姓名

SIGNATURE - FIRMA - 申請人簽名

DATE - FECHA - 日期

RESIDENCE ADDRESS - RESIDENCIA DIRECCION - 住址

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:

請將選票寄給本人下址

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter, in accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter’s Initials

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente.

Descripción del Impedimento/Incapacidad
Iniciales del Votante

FOREIGN CITIZENSHIP
申訴士房籍

FOR REGISTRAR’S USE ONLY
Prec. No. ____________
A.V. Prec. No. ____________
Ballot Type ____________
Affidavit No. ____________
Signature and Registration
Verified as Correct:

Date ____________
Deputy Registrar

La presente solicitud de clasificación como votante ausente permanente, es hecha en cumplimiento con los requisitos del artículo 1451 de la Ley Electoral, y se hace a nombre de [nombre del votante ausente permanente].
FROM:

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION? (¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M., TUESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1984
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

발표재진출을 7일 전에 5:00 PM에 신청해야 합니다.

EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA ELECCION.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fisherman's Wharf is a valued segment of the community and needs your help to ensure its economic wellbeing.
A YES vote on Proposition A will provide the needed financing to build the long awaited breakwater to ensure the safety of our commercial fishing fleet, create new berths and new jobs.
A YES vote on Proposition A will repair the Jefferson Street Seawall before it becomes a dangerous hazard to our visitors and to our community.
A YES vote will insure the economic vitality of Fisherman's Wharf as well as the entire San Francisco Waterfront.
Join with us and vote YES.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Louis Ferrari, President
Crab Boat Owner's Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The opportunity is NOW!
Our Northern Waterfront is alive with activity—increase in passenger ships, thriving commercial developments.
Let us fuse that energy into our Southern Waterfront and take advantage of our natural deep water. That means newer, deeper draft merchant ships, increased cargoes and new jobs.
Missed opportunities cannot be recaptured. So act now! Don't let this opportunity get away.
Vote YES on Proposition A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our waterfront is an outstandingly beautiful and profitable aspect of San Francisco. The port has been badly neglected, however. We need to VOTE YES ON PROP A to improve and rebuild cargo and passenger facilities.
PROP A will guarantee increased maritime activities, new jobs, the revival of our fishing industry, and the safety of shoreline areas.
And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER! For our neighborhood, and for our City, VOTE YES ON PROP A!

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors

Phyllis Kern
Golden Gate Democratic Club*
Jim Wachob
District 8 Democratic Club*
Kevin Malone
District 8 Democratic Club*
Bette Landis
Democratic Women's Forum*
Rebecca Evans
Sierra Club*
Beverly Karnatz
Committee for Better Parks
and Recreation in Chinatown*

Richard Livingston
Golden Gate Democratic Club*
Adia Garabedian
Andrea Jepson
Madrid Hamilton
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Wallinda McCrea
Douglas Engmann
Dale Carlson
Stafford Buckley
Dick Pabich
Ron Huberman

*for identification purposes only
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a great port city. And the San Francisco Port has always been a leading employer of minorities. But the Port has sadly deteriorated. It has not kept up with modernizations and improvements. And what is even worse, it has not kept up with the competition. The Port MUST adapt to container cargo, and put in railway access to the docks. With your vote YES ON A, we can take advantage of our deep water harbor, attract more shipping trade, increase cargoes, and produce many more jobs.

And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!
VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Naomi Gray
Doris Thomas

J. E. Thomas
A. Brooks
Frankie Gillette
Lois DeCayette
Joel DeCayette
Julie Anderson
Althea Carrie
George Newkirk
Elouise Westbrook
Shirley Jones
Clifton Jeffers
Joe Williams
Carol Belle
Benjamin James
Grandvel Jackson
Amos Brown

Faye Anderson
Zuretti Goosby
Stan Palomares-Criollos
Jene Rita Alviar
Ernest C. Ayala
Alan S. Wong
Stan Moy
Douglas S. Chan
Thomas Hsieh
Alicia Wang
Ben Tom
Pius Lee
Julie Tang
Louis Hop Lee
Dennis Wong
Melvin Dong Lee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our Port now needs $42 million to develop San Francisco's maritime facilities to compete with ports such as Oakland, Seattle and San Diego.

These improved facilities are vital to San Francisco's competition for jobs and trade for the Pacific. Currently all major west coast ports are building to meet the growing needs of America's Pacific Trade. These ports have each spent an average of $57 million on recent container cargo expansion while San Francisco has spent nothing.

San Francisco must have at least comparable facilities in order to compete in this market. If the port is not developed for container cargo, San Francisco can forget about being a major port on the west coast as well as lose the jobs and revenue that a modern port could produce.

The Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that you vote to bring San Francisco the jobs and business that will be created by these revenue bonds. The bonds will be paid off from Port revenue and there is no taxpayer risk.

If you want to see the Port continue to grow and prosper vote yes on Proposition A.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reconstruct municipal harbor facilities!!!:

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

Juanita G. Raven
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committeeman
Bob Geary
Democratic County Committeeman
Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Martin Eng
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Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

When something is railroaded through City Hall on a "fast track", it is always difficult not to join the stampede. This, however, is a bond issue in an amount larger than necessary to perform the actual work contemplated; not backed by written leases; and not backed even by "letter agreements" with corporations which supposedly will use Piers 80, 94 and 96 if improvements are made. This bond issue was rushed through the Board of Supervisors. Transmitted to the Board on July 24th, a scant six days later (on July 30th) and without a specific noticed public hearing, the Board voted 7-1 to place it on the ballot. I dissented because more time was needed for a proper analysis and public input.

Presently, the Port has a debt service requirement of approximately $104,000,000.00. This proposed revenue bond issue would increase the debt service requirement to $228,261,400.00; a staggering rise. The $42,500,000.00 bond issue would produce but $40,202,000.00 in net proceeds. The Port has a surplus of about $19,000,000.00, of which approximately $15,000,000.00 is available for capital projects. The Controller says $49,254,660.00, would thus be available for capital projects costing $41,610,000.00.

The Port is borrowing $7,644,660.00 more than is needed for these seven capital projects. Why? The Port admits it has no long-term written commitments for Piers 80, 94 and 96 which account for $37,570,000.00 of the total bond issue. How can we be assured that the bondholders will be repaid by revenues from those piers if there are no-long term commitments?

Moreover, the Port hasn't even secured written "letter agreements" from corporations to assure that if those improvements are made, they will sign long-term commitments. Ironically, but $4,000,000.00 of the bond issue would be spent on needed improvements for Fisherman's Wharf tenants, who generate almost 50% of net Port income, money which would be used to repay the money borrowed for Piers 80, 94 and 96. It's like the tail wagging the dog.

Selling bonds is nothing more than borrowing money. Why borrow more money than you have to, and why borrow money for projects which don't have long-term tenants? Be assured that even if this passes, I intend to persist in making Port officials answer those very questions.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

MOTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION A

MOTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A MEASURE AUTHORIZING THE PORT COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS TO FINANCE THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION OF CERTAIN PORT FACILITIES TO BE LOCATED AT THE PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby orders submitted to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 6, 1984 a measure authorizing the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to issue revenue bonds, all as set forth in the following measure, to wit:

Shall the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $42,500,000 the proceeds of which will be used to modernize container handling facilities and to upgrade various other maritime-oriented facilities at the Port of San Francisco's piers 35, 80, 94 and 96 and at the Jefferson Street seawall, to construct a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf, to construct an intermodal container transfer facility, to install a backflow prevention system at various locations, to replace various transformers and capacitors throughout the port, and to acquire, construct or renovate certain works, property or structures necessary or convenient for the operation of, and at, the Port of San Francisco, which facilities are operated by the Port Commission?

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

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

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
**PROPOSITION B.**

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Public Utilities Commission operates the San Francisco Water Department. When the Commission needs funds to acquire, improve or develop Water Department facilities, it may issue revenue bonds to raise the funds. Before the Commission can issue revenue bonds, a majority of the voters must approve. The revenue bonds are then paid from Water Department revenues.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition B would allow the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds. Funds from the sale of the bonds would be used to acquire, improve or develop facilities necessary for the operation of the Water Department, including filtration plants and reservoirs. The bonds would be paid off from the revenues of the Water Department.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance Water Department improvements.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want the Public Utilities Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

**Controller's Statement on “B”**

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

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

- Bond redemption: $104,000,000
- Bond interest: 169,260,000
- Total debt service requirement: $273,260,000

"Based on a five year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning one year after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $3,467,000 to a maximum of $14,022,000 annually for thirty-one years.

"In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Water Department revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Water Department sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Water Department. Analysis of projected resources available to the Water Department indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years."

**How Supervisors Voted on “B”**

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on a resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The money from these bonds will be used to assure that drinking water we take from our Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs on the Peninsula is pure and meets all health standards. The bonds will be repaid from revenues of our Water Department. Not a penny will be charged on the property tax rolls or to the general taxpayers.

We have two huge lakes along side I-280 on the Peninsula, the Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs. About 15% of our drinking water in normal times comes from these lakes and others in Alameda County. For decades we used this water without filtration. Now, however, health officials tell us that all of the water from our Peninsula lakes must be filtered before it can be used. We now have a very limited filtering capacity which means that if, for any reason, our water supply from the Sierras were interrupted or reduced and we would need more local water, we would be unable to make full use of Crystal Springs water. There now is no filter plant at Crystal Springs. Whatever water we use from there must be pumped up to a small filtration plant at San Andreas before it can enter the system. This very severely limits the amount of drinking water we can draw from our nearest supply, and it is expensive. Passage of Proposition B would change all that.

By voting YES on B, you will provide for water system improvements including a new filtration plant right at Crystal Springs, for the expansion of the small plant at San Andreas, and for a necessary storage reservoir.

Your YES on B vote is an investment in the quality of our drinking water—an assurance that water from our nearest supply will be available to us pure, meeting all health requirements, when we need it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Generations ago, San Franciscans had the foresight to build one of the most magnificent water systems in the world—Hetch Hetchy, which brings water to San Francisco from the High Sierras.

Now, we must modernize the system to keep pace with higher standards of water quality.

Proposition B will authorize the San Francisco Water Department to issue $104 million in revenue bonds.

The money will be used to improve the system by expanding existing plants and by building additional filtration, treatment and holding facilities on Water Department properties on the Peninsula.

These facilities will provide safe drinking water for future generations of San Franciscans. Presently, if any of the existing facilities suffered a breakdown, the City could be forced to rely upon unfiltered water from Crystal Springs. The State Department of Public Health has directed the Water Department to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Our water is safe. It meets all state and Federal quality standards, and we want to keep it that way. Proposition B will assure low turbidity (silt content), reduce asbestos content, and prevent the spread of giardia lamblia, a virus not now found in our water system, but which could be brought in as watershed areas become more populated.

Proposition B, which will not have any effect on our tax structure, is a prudent investment, protecting our drinking water into the future. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote yes on Proposition B and help guarantee us pure, plentiful water.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION C

Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

YES 259

NO 260

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Department of Public Health operates the county hospitals, such as San Francisco General and Laguna Honda, and all other county public health services. The Department is run by a Public Health Director, who is appointed by the City's Chief Administrative Officer and who is responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would create a Health Commission, and place the Department of Public Health under the control of the Commission. The Commission would have seven members, appointed by the Mayor; no more than three members would be doctors, nurses, hospital administrators or other health care professionals. The Commission would appoint a Public Health Director, responsible to the Commission, to administer the Department. The Public Health Director could appoint and remove deputies to help administer the Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of a Health Commission appointed by the Mayor, and to be run by a Public Health Director, appointed by the Health Commission.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of the Chief Administrative Officer and to be run by a Public Health Director appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs of the Health Department, by approximately $8,400 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Public Health Department has a budget of over $270 million and a staff of 5000, making it the largest agency in City government. Its responsibilities are many and far-reaching: San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital; emergency medical services; mental health services; sanitation; public health education; district health centers; inspection of public and private facilities. The list is long and growing.

In recent years, the list of problems facing departmental administrators has, unfortunately, also grown. Emergency Aid stations were closed. Ambulance service was drastically altered. Proposals to reorganize community mental health services were promoted and rejected, causing confusion for all. The AIDS crisis. The investigations at San Francisco General Hospital. And on and on.

Too often, these decisions and these issues were considered in a vacuum, without public input, without public debate, and without public scrutiny.

Why? In order to protect the Department of Public Health from the graft and corruption that plagued our City at the turn of the century, the Charter placed the department under the Chief Administrative Officer’s auspices rather than a commission. Fifty years later, the department has outgrown this cumbersome arrangement. It is time to bring the administration of this important agency into the 20th Century, mirroring the management of other City departments.

Proposition C will establish a seven-member Health Commission, appointed by the Mayor, to set policy and supervise the Public Health Department. The commission will include both providers and consumers of health services. It will bring the Department more directly under the Mayor’s control, allowing for more timely responses to issues and problems. Most importantly, it will ensure that the department is publicly accountable for its actions.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Public health policy has changed and the governance of our public health department must change too.

In the past few years the state and federal governments have shifted more and more of the responsibility for public health management to local governments.

Recent experience shows that our health department is not presently equipped to manage public health programs in the most effective manner.

Proposition C will streamline management—cutting two levels of bureaucracy while opening up our public health policy to the public itself.

I urge a “yes” vote on Proposition C.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Since 1971, the Department of Public Health has been plagued with problems and crises at its hospitals, clinics and emergency aid stations. Most recently, we again faced the threat of San Francisco General losing its accreditation. These many incidents are deeply disturbing, raising troubling questions in the public mind: Why do these problems persist? Why can’t something be done about them once and for all?

In 1979, the national organization that accredits all hospitals reported that San Francisco General’s “major problems...are related to the lack of an effective governing body free from the political decision-making process which results in delayed activity, inadequate funding, etc.” Last January, the State auditors also cited the absence of “a governing body legally responsible for hospital governance” as a cause for “ineffective management.”

No other hospital in California operates without a board of directors. Only one other department in San Francisco (Public Works) operates without a commission. Instead, San Francisco General and the Health Department are run by a bureaucracy, insulated from public accountability.

Proposition C establishes a commission for the Health Department, one that will hold public hearing, make public decisions, and be publicly accountable. Vote YES.

Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

(Continued)
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's population is aging. In a few short years, a greater percentage of our citizens will be seniors—most living independently on fixed incomes, many frail and over 75—than those of other California cities. They will need nutritional information, home health care, and a broad range of coordinated social services.

The Department of Health, San Francisco General, Laguna Honda, the District Health Centers—these are critical providers of senior services. And as more and more state and federal programs are shifted to local agencies, the Department's role and responsibilities will dramatically increase.

How will the Department respond to this increased responsibility? How can we ensure that it will develop policies and programs that meet seniors' needs? And how can we be sure that these programs operate efficiently and effectively?

Proposition C is a big step in the right direction. VOTE YES!

Kathleen Lamers
Abraham Biderman
Jeanette Harris
Larry Bernardini, R.N.
Nancy Boughey, M.S.W.
David Lally, M.S.W.
Ollie Mae Black
Stephen Graham

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is important for women.

Women provide the majority of services offered by the Health Department. Indeed public health is traditionally the domain of women and nurses. And while the many crises at General are too often blamed on nursing care, nurses virtually have no role in planning or organizing service delivery.

Women are also the major consumers of the Department's services. As more and more block grants transfer health programs from the state and federal levels to local governments, the Department will become an increasingly important provider to women.

Proposition C gives women an opportunity to make their voices heard at the highest levels of the Health Department. And our voices must be heard if services are to be organized efficiently and responsively.

Louise Ogden
Lorraine R. Wiles
Elaine Adamson, M.P.H.
Barbara Engmann, R.N.
Ann Gonski
Ellen Roberts
Katherine Lambert
Catherine J. Dodd, R.N.
Priscilla Alexander
Sharyn Sasaki
Gail Dolson, R.N.
Laura Campbell
Flora A. Hurley
Cherie V. James
Judith Kurtz

Aurora Garcia
Tracey Cosgrove
Sally Martin, C.C.S.W.
Alexis Gonzales
Velma V. Gaines
Lili T. Davis
Ruth O'Brien-McMullen, R.N.
Shelley Spiro, R.N.
Arlene Carden, R.N.
Robin Dushane
Laurie Carlson
Janet Veatch, R.N.
Barbara Burges, R.N.M.S.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The policies governing San Francisco General affect every consumer and provider of health services in the City, yet there is little accountability to San Francisco taxpayers. No private hospital with General's size and influence operates without a board of trustees or directors. Indeed, no private organization of any kind with a $270 million annual budget—business, corporation, nonprofit foundation, whatever—operates without a governing board. Why does General?

As General bounces from one crisis to the next, with state and federal agencies threatening increasingly drastic actions, the weakness of the current management structure becomes clear to all. The Hospital and the Health Department need a commission, where public hearings can surface problems and issues in a timely fashion; where policies can be developed with the cooperation of private providers and consumers. The Health Commission will not be a watchdog meddling in day-to-day affairs, but an advocate for General, one providing continuity, stability and a rational decision-making process with regular rules and procedures.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Rolland Lowe, M.D.
Past President, San Francisco Medical Society
Robert Aaron, M.D.
Robert Gross, M.D.
Molly Coye, M.D.
Robert Koshiyama, D.D.S.
Maureen Katz, M.D.
Yoshio Nakashima, D.D.S.

James Cole, M.D.
John Good, M.D.
Jeff Sandler, M.D.
Judy Keeven, M.D.
Robert Dickter, D.D.S.
Jeffrey Draisin, M.D.
Gabriel Escobar, M.D.
Brad Evans, M.D.

Lars Erickson, M.D.
Randy Yanda, M.D.
Stephen Collins, M.D.
Lewis Pepper, M.D.
Mark Smith, M.D.
Donald Goldmacher, M.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is obligated to ensure that all San Francisco communities have access to medical services. The AIDS crisis brought the health care needs of gay men to the forefront of public discussion. It brought home the importance of a Department flexible and responsive to quickly emerging problems and epidemics, one capable of quickly reallocating resources to dire community needs.

The general health needs of gay men and women, however, are largely unrecognized. The Health Commission will give our community the voice it needs in the health planning processes. It will ensure that the diversity of our City is represented in the consideration of these important issues.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Ron Huberman
Sal Rosselli
Richard Allman
John Mehring
Jeff Jones
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Donald Cataland
Debra Friedland
Cleave Jones
Roberto Esteves
Randy Stallings

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Hispanics in San Francisco strongly support Proposition C, the Health Commission Charter Amendment.

Health is vital to the Latino Community of San Francisco. We are a younger population, with larger families and with special health needs, such as those of Central American refugees. In recent years, federal and state funding for health programs has decreased, leaving community health programs in a difficult financial situation. Recent changes in Medically Indigent Adult services have also negatively impacted our community.

In addition, the need for better and expanded bilingual medical services continues to be a top priority in San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition C.

Celso Ortiz
Rafael Cedillos
Maria Degado
Roberto Hernandez
Joanna Devito-Larson
Rosa Maria Clos
Susan Houston
Arnell Rodrigues
P. Braveman, M.D.
Alfredo Rodrigues
Sonia Melara
Joseph Tanner
Edgar Quiroz
Angel Courereras

Roger Hernandez
Tom Romero
Raphael Taliaferro
Juanita DelCarlo
Juan Pifarre
Rudolph Mathias
Rolph Hurtado
Alfredo Rivas
Vilma Mondoza
O. Bracker
Ray Rivera
Lorenzo Dill
Yolanda Cameros
Monica Asturias

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

The chief opposition to Proposition C comes from two sources: The Chief Administrative Officer and the officials of the University of California Medical Center. The CAO's opposition is understandable. He simply doesn't want to lose control of the Health Department and SF General.

UC's opposition is more puzzling, until you realize that it receives $10-15 million from the City each year for staffing at General Hospital without a publicly reviewed contract! Why is UC afraid of having its relationship with General publicly scrutinized by a Health Commission?

Let's clear the air. Vote YES on Proposition C.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

We support Proposition C.

Fred Ross
James O'Connor
Dale Carlson
Pamela Duffy
Gerald Yoachum
D.J. Soviero
Rosalind Wolf
Gordon Brownell
Jim Wachob
Steven Krefting
JoAnne Miller
Maura Kealey
Margaret O'Driscoll
Nicerita Revele

Beatrice Patterson
Thomas Ambrogi
Arlo Hale Smith
Dian Blomquist
Thomas Moore
Peter Hanson
Jack Morrison
Mary Vail
Sally Osaki
Linda Post
Terrance Farr
Ken McEldowney
Sue Hestor
Willie Gee, D.D.S.
Agar Jaicks
John Holtzclaw

Paul Vacaralli
Al Cassiato
Alan Raznick
James Haas
Al Borvice
Essie Webb
Joan Moulton
Russell Zellers
Stanley Shields
Richard Sevilla
Ann Daley
Dorothy Labudde
Dorice Murphy
Howard Strassner
Mark Davalos
Larry Griffin

Jay Wallace
Rob Waters
Kevin Malone
Jan Holloway
Norman Rolfe
Tom Jones
Barbara Halliday
Sandra Powell
Deborah Sarvis
Esther Marks
James Augustino
Sharon Johnson
Eileen Adams
Ruth Gravans
Michael Heffer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Community clinics provide thousands of San Franciscans with access to essential primary health care and preventive health services. Yet, these community-based institutions, as well as the neighborhoods and people they represent, have been excluded from participation in health policy decision-making in San Francisco. Excluded, too, is any public debate on alternatives to hospital-based health delivery and financing systems that could prove cost-effective and could better serve the people of San Francisco.

Proposition C, The Health Commission Charter Amendment, offers a forum for public discussion of local health policy issues. By giving the neighborhoods and communities input into health policy decisions, the Health Commission will enable San Franciscans to create a new community of interest and new community of action in the area of health service delivery.

VOTE YES on PROPOSITION C.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Commission will be of vital importance to the Asian community. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

David Yamakawa
Ernest Wu
Joe Jung
George Suncin
Sophie Wong
Pattie Fong
Willie Gee, D.D.S.

Dr. Yoshio Nakashima
Louis Hop Lee
Samuel Chung

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is a key source of medical services in the black community, both directly through General Hospital and the district health centers, and indirectly through community and mental health clinics. But our special problems—an infant mortality rate significantly above rates in other Bay Area counties, for example—are not often heard by the Department's policy-makers, for they are insulated and isolated from our community.

Our concerns must be heard if they are to be addressed. Proposition C gives us a platform from which to speak. Vote YES.

Elouise Westbrook
Yvonne Golden
Lorenzo R. Dill
Zaretti L. Goosby, D.D.S
Julianne Malveaux
Eugene Coleman
Naomi T. Gray

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This proposal to put politics into the Department of Public Health by creating a "commission" to direct it is an example of the misguided philosophy of attacking governmental problems by throwing bureaucracy at them. It should be soundly defeated. Currently, the City's health officials report to one person, the Chief Administrative Officer, who can respond swiftly to any crisis and set consistent policy. The responsibility for the Department lies with the CAO, not a group of political appointees. When our Charter was adopted in 1932, the freeholders explained the rationale of giving the CAO management responsibility over the Health Department. The idea was "to provide reasonable safeguards AGAINST POLITICAL MANIPULATION." (Emphasis added) Their report stated the office of CAO was designed to be "protected from political influence as largely as possible . . ." and "it is intended that this officer shall be entirely independent in discharging the function of the office, and particularly, to be free from interference of the mayor, because the latter is subjected to political influence." Although the Charter was adopted in 1932, its logic still makes powerful sense. Besides blurring lines of responsibility, this iniquitous proposal contradicts health management practices in California and the United States. In fact, the same idea was evaluated in 1971 by a committee established by the supervisors, which concluded that the commission concept, a "seemingly attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another bureaucratic layer in an already cluttered city administrative structure." To paraphrase The Progress, the Muni is the best proof that "the presence of a commission does not guarantee good management." Vote NO on Proposition C.

Supervisor 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.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The enactment of Proposition C would set the clock back on health care delivery in San Francisco to the 1920s. As proposed, the measure would almost exactly duplicate the system of Health Care abandoned by The City in 1932 because it had become corrupt, politicized and incapable of effectively responding to the growing challenges of modern health care administration.

In 1973 the Board of Supervisors itself considered and rejected a similar Health Commission option. The board's reason was that commissions do not make effective management tools. "The Commission, seemingly an attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another layer in an already cluttered City administration structure."

The commission concept also goes counter to sound health management practices. Earlier this year, a team of top Bay Area health care professionals was asked to identify the leading municipal hospitals in the country. None of the institutions identified uses a commission form of administration largely because commissions, while perhaps capable of overseeing some urban systems such as mass transit, have proven ineffective and cumbersome.

The argument has been advanced that a commission would allow for greater citizen input into the health department. The fact is that the Department of Health already has some 440 individuals serving on 27 Citizen Advisory Committees—more than with any other city department. The proposed seven member commission would be insufficient in both size and technical competence to do other than deal with the health care in San Francisco on a "crisis-to-crisis" basis.

As we move into the 21st Century, the administration of San Francisco's health care systems will only become more challenging. A form of governance that proved inadequate 50 years ago and was rejected by the Board of Supervisors eleven years ago as inappropriate, is not the best way to provide for our city's health care needs of the future. We urge you to vote "No" on Proposition C.

Dr. Frank Lewis, Chief of Staff, San Francisco General Hospital
Walter Newman, Overseer, UCSF
Yori Wada, UC Board of Regents
Dr. Frank Curry, Former Director of Public Health
Dr. Frank Sooy, Chancellor Emeritus, UCSF
Virginia Leishman, Director of Nursing, Laguna Honda Hospital

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

A vote for Proposition C is a vote to politicize health care in San Francisco. The authors of the 1932 City Charter foresaw this when they abolished the city's highly politicized seven member health commission and placed the Department of Health under the jurisdiction of the Chief Administrative Officer. Proposition C would return San Francisco to the pre-1932 system of politicized health care management.

In writing the 1932 Charter, the authors recognized the need to balance executive authority by splitting it between the Mayor and the CAO. Departments, such as health, which were thought to be best managed if protected from direct political influence, were placed under the jurisdiction of the CAO, who is appointed for a fixed 10 year term to remove the office from political pressure.

Despite the occurrence of problems the system has worked well. San Francisco General has perhaps the best Trauma Unit in the country. The hospital's AIDS unit is unquestionably the best and most humane in the nation.

Moving control of the city's health care budget from the Chief Administrative Officer to the Executive will create a "strong mayor" type of government which the Charter was designed to prevent. Health commissioners would necessarily be beholden to the political factions or individuals which lobbied for their appointment and to the mayor who appoints them.

There are alternatives to a Health Commission. Several have already been recommended by a blue ribbon panel of health management experts appointed following the report on General Hospital. We believe these recommendations and perhaps others, including a variation on the health commission concept, deserve further study.

Proposition C would bring about a radical restructuring of government and health care delivery in San Francisco. Both issues are far too important to be decided hastily. We urge a No vote on Proposition C.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, President, Board of Supervisors
Florette White Pomeroy, Consultant
William K. Coblenz, Attorney
Thomas E. Horn, VP, Board of Trustees, War Memorial
J. Gary Shansby, Chairman of the Board, Shaklee Corporation
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission

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

I oppose Proposition C because:
1. It puts the Health Department under the control of politically appointed non-professionals. I cannot agree that this should be done. It brings in politics and throws out expertise.

2. It adds an extra layer of bureaucracy making government more expensive and management more difficult.

 Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Your City Hall representatives would have you believe that by replacing our present Health System with a Health Commission, composed of seven members, at a recompense of $100 per month, will improve the services.

Hogwash. Just another layer of government.

With a budget of $270 millions, 5000 employees would you put your faith in the hands of seven and still maintain the same Health Director?

What we need is a clean sweep of the present management; new faces; new ideas. The Charter provides for this, let's do it—"Now," not later.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION C

Marguerite A. Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

By creating a health commission for the Public Health Department, the city of San Francisco would create more problems rather than solve them.

Past experience has indicated a need to separate politics from health care. San Francisco would be turning the clock back to a situation in the 1920s when the city had a seven member commission appointed by the Mayor that oversaw the management of the Public Health Department. The delivery of effective health care was seriously compromised by the politicized department which was a direct consequence of the department's health commission.

For this reason, the citizens of San Francisco at that time passed a charter reform that removed the Health Department from the politically appointed commission and placed it in a newly created Chief Administrative Officer who would be secured against political pressures.

The creation of the Health Commission would take 40% of the budget of the Chief Administrative Officer's budget and place it under the control of a politically appointed Commission, thus negating the intent of the Chief Administrative Officer's Department which was created to administer departments that should be removed from political concerns.

Do not politicize San Francisco's health care. Vote No on Proposition C.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, Health, County Agricultural Department; Health Advisory Board; Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the (Continued on page 82)
PROPOSITION D
Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?

YES 261
NO 262

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement Board has complete authority to invest the funds of the Retirement System for city employees. The Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would remove the requirement that the Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California. Instead, the proposition would require the Retirement Board to make investments with the care and skill that a prudent person would make under similar circumstances.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the way the Retirement Board invests pension money. Instead of making only those investments which are legal for insurance companies, the Board would be able to make any investments that a prudent person would make.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Retirement Board to keep making only the same kind of investments which are legal for insurance companies.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-5 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.


Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, increase the cost of government. However, as a result of its authorizing additional flexibility for investments, earnings may be higher or lower than what could have occurred absent this amendment.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 63.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote YES on Proposition D.

The purpose of Proposition D is to clarify the investment responsibility of the Retirement Board and to add language expressly to comply with the recently enacted State Constitutional amendment on fiduciary standards for public pension plans (Proposition 21, June 1984).

Since 1932, the charter has referred to the Insurance Code as the guideline for pension investments.

Insurance Code investment requirements are unsuitable to current pension fund investment practices and severely restrict the ability of the Retirement Board to manage the fund to achieve the best possible investment return for the City and County of San Francisco and the members of the Retirement System.

The added new language will establish firm guidelines for the Retirement Board to discharge its responsibility as the fiduciary for the Retirement Fund. This new language will also serve as increased protection for members of the Retirement System by applying recognized fiduciary standards for which there is considerable statutory and case law.

In summary, the proposed charter amendment serve a dual purpose: it removes obsolete and ambiguous language and brings the Retirement System into compliance with the State Constitution. Both changes will enhance and improve the System's investment capabilities and the ability to achieve its goals and objectives.

Proposition D is endorsed and supported by the Retirement Board and the Board of Supervisors.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This is a worthwhile Charter amendment which updates obsolete and ambiguous provisions on how the Retirement Board can invest funds. It institutes standards consistent with a recent voter-approved amendment to the California Constitution. Investment practices have been refined dramatically in the past 50 years, and income and appreciation choices have increased tremendously. The investment professionals working for the Retirement System now are prevented from making the very most prudent investments possible, and City employees and taxpayers are, thus, prejudiced and hurt.

Present investment rules are based upon the State Insurance Code, which contravenes contemporary investment practices. Proposition D will give more latitude in making high-return investments, but will also retain vigorous guidelines on investment of Retirement System funds while increasing the protection of City employees. It will save money for taxpayers by enabling a better return on Retirement System assets. It's logical. That's why I recommend a "yes" vote.

Quentin L. Kopf, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive, and may continue to receive, benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies in California.

The retirement board shall discharge its duties with respect to the system with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with these matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like aims.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name

Address _______________________________ Apt. # ______

Telephone No. (required) _______________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) __________________________________

Signature ________________________________
Surviving Spouse Benefits

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system? YES 264 NO 265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a health care fund for active and retired employees. The City's contribution to this fund equals the average amount contributed to health care funds for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco. The City does not contribute anything for spouses of active or retired employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would provide that the City contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the health care fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Bill Maher.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs and present membership data of the Health Service System, in excess of $990,000 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 67.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This charter amendment calls for extending a limited measure of aid from the City and County of San Francisco for the health care of the surviving spouse of an active or retired City employee.

Under existing statute, the City and County and its employees, active or retired, share the cost of health care for the employee, their spouse and children. However, upon the death of the employee, the City and County’s share of payments to the health care system stops.

Thus, the surviving spouse is compelled to pick up the entire cost for the health care plan while struggling to survive on a reduced family income and, at the same time, contend with ever increasing medical/hospital expenses and everyday living costs for themselves and eligible family dependents.

Proposition E will allow the City and County to continue paying its share into the health care system and not force the surviving spouse and eligible family dependents to assume the entire financial burden for health care payments.

Since the number of surviving spouses affected is very small, less than 1400, the cost to the taxpayer for the City and County is minimal.

The changes proposed by Proposition E should have been made many years ago; it is long overdue. We urge you to support this important measure.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Justice tempered with compassion. VOTE YES. Surviving spouses of City workers receive an automatic 50% cut in retirement pay upon the death of their partners. Why further burden this small group by withdrawing subsidy for health care?

The Retirement System actuary has officially confirmed that the average pension check for this group is $300.00 per month; incidentally, below the nationally quoted poverty level.

Argentina ontinued...
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E if approved would require the city to subsidize the health premiums of the surviving spouses of non-uniformed city employees. The cost to the city would amount to $990,000 per year and give city employees a benefit that is not normally enjoyed by workers in private industry.

The majority of private employees have health plans that allow surviving spouses to be members of such plans but the employer does not subsidize the premiums of these survivors in anyway. Being permitted to join a group plan that provides comprehensive coverage at a reasonable rate is a sufficient benefit in and of itself.

If this amendment is approved it will violate the spirit of the Charter provision that sets city employee salaries and benefits at the average of that which prevails in the metropolitan Bay Area. We believe in fair treatment and compensation for city employees and our current rules provide exactly that.

Vote No on Proposition E.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

The city and county, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition hereof submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1973 shall be effective July 1, 1973 1985.
Employee Death Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?

YES 267
NO 268

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, who is a member of the Retirement System is entitled to a death benefit of six months salary if he or she dies, regardless of cause, before retirement. The benefit is paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would provide that if an officer or employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, is injured through external and violent means in the course of employment and the employee dies within 180 days of the injury, an additional benefit of 12 months salary would be paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to pay an additional benefit of 12 months salary to a city employee who dies from an injury caused by external and violent means in the course of employment.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to provide an additional death benefit to these city employees who die from external and violent means in the course of employment.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the number of employees and their respective salary rates which qualify for payment under the provisions of this proposed amendment. Based on experience to date, the cost of this additional amount should not be substantial.”

TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 69.
Employee Death Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F provides a small compensation for the survivor of a city employee (non Police or Fire) killed in the line of duty. Let’s agree to this minor expenditure for the survivors of those who have died in city service.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Only rarely is a city employee killed in the line of duty, but death can come with fierce suddenness.

Two Muni workers were crushed by cable car machinery in 1978; the following year, two Water Department employees were murdered at the Lake Merced Pumping Station; and in March 1981, a Hetch Hetchy lineman fell to his death.

For the families of the vast majority of city workers, there is little protection when death comes. Police officers and fire fighters already have special death benefits.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Proposition F is designed to correct a serious inequity on behalf of miscellaneous members of the Retirement System who are killed in line of duty or who die as a result of a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury.

Under current charter provisions, a designated beneficiary of a member who dies in the course of employment from any cause receives the member’s contributions to the system, plus six months’ salary.

Proposition F focuses only on those members who are killed in the line of duty or who die within 180 days from a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury. Beneficiaries of such members will be accorded an additional insurance benefit of twelve months’ salary.

The payment of additional compensation to a designated beneficiary will be subject to the independent hearing officer process as set forth in the City charter.

Proposition F is fair and equitable and, based on actuarial projections, the cost is minimal.

Proposition F is sponsored and endorsed by the Retirement Board, unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, and strongly supported by Mayor Dianne Feinstein.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

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

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

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

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

(Continued on page 84)
Police Probationary Period

PROPOSITION G

Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?

YES 270
NO 271

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers entering the Police Department serve a one-year probationary period. During the first 32 weeks, the police officer goes through the police training program. After successfully completing training, the officer is then assigned to regular police duties. The Police Department has 20 weeks to evaluate the officer while on regular police duty. After this 20 week period, the probation is complete.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would extend the probationary period of the police officer to one year after the completion of the training. In no event would it extend the probationary period beyond 84 weeks from the date of entry. Any termination for breach of duty or misconduct would require charges and a hearing before the Police Commission.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the probationary period for a police officer to be extended to one year after completing the police training course but not to exceed 84 weeks.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the probationary period for a police officer to remain one year after the date of entry into the department.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Your YES vote for this amendment will enable the Police Department to provide more effective police services by ensuring that after officers graduate from the Academy and complete a field training program, an adequate probationary evaluation period exists to determine an officer's fitness to perform police duties. Society demands much from its police officers. As the nature of police work has become increasingly complex, training and performance evaluation functions must meet the needs of an ever-evolving profession.

Great expenditure of time and money are invested in training police officers. Presently, if a recruit is not deemed ready for duty, the probationary period can be completed during any retraining, thus making it difficult and costly to determine ultimate fitness for duty.

By voting YES, you will give the Chief of Police time necessary to adequately train and evaluate an officer's performance and to better ensure quality police services.

The Police Department has met and conferred with the Police Officers' Association regarding this amendment and has obtained that organization's support for its passage.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Police Chief asked for a longer probationary period because it is needed. Vote yes.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition G.

In recent years, because San Francisco has had the financial strength to do so, we've steadily expanded the size of the Police Department.

It is now the largest ever, with 1987 officers.

More and more officers are being assigned to our neighborhoods on beats and in patrol cars. We want the best officers possible.

That's why Proposition G is so important. It will give the Department greater ability to screen out officers who do not measure up to the strict standards of professionalism this city demands.

Proposition G will extend the probation period for a new officer to one complete year following completion of his or her field training.

Presently, probation starts when an officer is first inducted into the Department, before 18 weeks of class work in the City's outstanding Police Academy and an additional 14 weeks of field training.

As strenuous as the class work and the training may be, the real test of an officer is on the street.

That's where his or her coolness, competence and compassion—in fact, all the qualities that this city wants in a superior police department—can be observed and tested.

Proposition G will give the department a full year to evaluate an officer in uniform and on the job.

Those who don't measure up can be dismissed after a departmental hearing. Protected will be the City's rightful concern that our police officers can truly be described as the City's finest.

Proposition G is a common-sense measure, sought by the Chief of Police, that will strengthen the San Francisco Police Department. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Police commanders need more time to evaluate the recruits' "street" performance. Proposition G does that by extending the on-the-job probationary period up to one year. For the sake of our children, neighbors and all San Franciscans, I want to be sure that a police officer is fully competent from a practical standpoint, not merely because of a classroom perspective. Therefore, I support Proposition G, and I urge you to vote for it, too.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Police Motorcycle Pay

PROPOSITION H

Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?

YES 274
NO 275

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and who are assigned to the Traffic Division get bonus pay. Police officers who ride motorcycles as part of their job, but who are assigned to duties other than traffic, do not get bonus pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would give all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job to get the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want only those San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and are assigned to the Traffic Division to get bonus pay.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted "No."

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current rates of pay, staffing and assignments by the police department, the cost of government would be increased by approximately $74,000 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Honda Motorcycle Unit of the San Francisco Police Department has, because of antiquated charter language, been denied payment of the hazard pay which is currently given the two-wheel motorcycle officers in the Traffic Division.

Because the primary function of the Honda Motorcycle Unit is crime fighting and not traffic enforcement, the word "traffic" must be deleted from the charter in order to compensate equally all officers who perform hazardous motorcycle duty.

Please join us in voting YES for this very fair charter amendment.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

In 1970, the San Francisco Police Department created a unit of light weight motorcycles to patrol Golden Gate Park and the beaches surrounding the City. In 1977 these duties were drastically changed to counteract rising street crimes around the Western Addition. Neighborhood associations, seeing the effectiveness of the unit, also requested additional patrols by these motorcycle officers. Since 1977 the Honda Unit has been assigned to virtually every neighborhood in the City to reduce purse snatches, "red light" robberies, drug racing, and street narcotics traffic, along with demonstrations, marches, parades, and sporting events all over the City.

Also occurring since 1977 have been injuries to these highly visible, highly vulnerable motorcycle officers. Some of these injuries include: one officer hit near on and another officer suffering a leg broken by an auto which ran a red light. There have been numerous officers struck by other vehicles causing injuries, and injuries due to other road hazards (oil slicks, pothole etc.). These have increased sharply since the Honda Unit has been assigned to primarily street patrol. One officer was shot twice while patrolling the Western Addition for purse snatchers.

It is obvious that these officers are no longer "just" patrolling the parks and beaches as they were initially intended, but are now assigned to patrol the streets of the most crime-ridden areas of the City combating street crimes and enforcing traffic laws. These officers on prior occasions have requested Motorcycle Hazard Pay (which traffic enforcement two-wheel motorcycle officers already receive) for their patrol of these neighborhoods and streets on the two-wheel motorcycles but have been denied because of outdated wording in the Charter. Passage of this amendment would correct this inequity.

Al Casalino
President, S.F.P.O.A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

All police officers who ride motorcycles in the course of duty face special danger and deserve the premium pay already allowed for motorcycle traffic officers.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

A police officer on a two-wheeler is often the first on the scene of a major crime or emergency. Day after day, there is no more hazardous duty for our police.

Whether on a motorcycle in pursuit or patrol on city streets, or on a motorbike on patrol in the remote areas of the City’s parklands, an officer lives with danger. Because they can cut through traffic, the two-wheelers are often first to arrive at a shooting, or other robbery or car crash.

The City Charter has long recognized the dangers inherent in this essential police work and has provided hazard-pay for motorcycle officers of the Traffic Division.

Proposition H simply extends hazard-pay to the 17 or so officers on the equality-perilous motorcycle detail.

The amount of money involved is small—only $176 a month for each officer. Proposition H is small recognition of the dangers the police daily face in the line of duty. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor
PROPOSITION I

(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?

YES 278
NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco does not have an official position on whether federal taxes should be used for certain kinds of defense spending.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I says the Board of Supervisors must inform the President and certain other federal officials that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether they want their tax dollars used for certain kinds of "excessive military expenditures", as defined in the measure. Proposition I also says the City's Chief Administrative Officer must publish an annual report on the amount of federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents, what portion of these taxes are used for military spending, and what portion are used for social or human needs. The Board of Supervisors would appoint a seven-member Citizens' Advisory Committee to oversee the preparation of the report.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you think federal officials should be told that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending. You also want the City to publish an annual report on how federal tax dollars collected from San Francisco residents are spent.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don't think taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending, and you don't want the City to publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents.

How "I" Got on Ballot

On August 23, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition relating to military and social expenditures had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The proponents of the petition had gathered 12,371 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 2. The proponents are officially listed as G.C. Barnes, L.J. Crowe, H.J. Hobi and R.A. Wall.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,304 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,352 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

"Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time but should not be substantial."

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 75.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

This initiative should be passed because it educates people about excessive military spending and sends a clear message to the Federal Government that people want a choice as to how their taxes are spent.

Homer Hobl
Chairperson
The Humanist Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

Why waste taxpayers' money for a handful of misguided individuals?

City government is mandated to govern local citizens affairs.

Martin Eng
School Board Candidate

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION 1

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

Section 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following terms are defined:

(a) Excessive military expenditures: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is destined for research, development, and production of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons, research, development, and production of outer space laser-beam technology weapons (popularly known as “star-war” weapons) research and development, and production of chemical and biological warfare military aid, both overt and covert.

(b) Social and human needs: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is used for education, housing, health and human services, public transportation, and the like.

(c) San Francisco taxpayers: any individual who pays federal taxes and who is a resident of the city of San Francisco.

Section 2. The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco shall notify the President of the United States and the Vice-President, all members of the President's Cabinet, and the members of Congress that it is the policy of the people of San Francisco to pass on the Federal Government to use the Federal budget at the time they report their federal taxes whether they want any part of their contribution to used for excessive military expenditures. This policy shall also be published for the people of San Francisco in major city newspapers.

Section 3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall be responsible for the publication of an annual report giving the amount of the federal budget allocated to military expenditures and the percentage that is necessary for the operation of the government of San Francisco. This annual report shall include the following amounts:

(a) Any portion of the revenues contributed by the Federal Government.

(b) Any portion of the revenues in any budget not for any type of military expenditures:

(c) Any portion of the revenues in any budget for excessive military expenditures:

(d) Any portion of the revenues in any budget for social or human needs:

Section 4. The Board of Supervisors shall appoint a Citizens' Advisory Committee every year to review the preparation of the report and to ensure that no language is obscene or improper. The Citizens' Advisory Committee shall consist of seven members, at least six of whom shall be volunteers from the community at large and two from San Francisco.

The Board shall use the most current figures available from the Federal government in the state of publication, during the process for the compilation of the necessary report and budgetary breakdown in San Francisco. The report shall include upon the Federal and budgetary agencies for the state much, budgetary figures, and produce accurate compilation.

The Chief Administrative Officer shall publish the report in the two newspapers of largest circulation in San Francisco, or earlier than 10 days before the meeting of the Board in which the report is filed after its adoption.
South African Investment Policy

PROPOSITION J

(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?

YES 283
NO 284

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco has no policy about the investment of pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco and its agencies not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa. This would be the official policy until Black people are given full political and civil rights by the government of South Africa.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want it to be the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City and County of San Francisco to have an official policy against investing pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition on South African investment policy had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Julianne Malveaux, the official proponent of the petition drive, had gathered 11,404 signatures which she turned in to the Registrar on August 8.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,520 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

"Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, investment income may be affected in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We support removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa because we believe the city of San Francisco should not support the reprehensible institution of apartheid. Non-whites in South Africa are denied freedom of association, freedom of mobility, freedom of speech, and voting rights. San Franciscans support this inequality when city pension funds are invested in companies that do business with South Africa.

This investment is also a very risky investment since any civil unrest in South Africa may lower the value of the investment. Other investment possibilities will equal or exceed current yields on the pension portfolio.

We support this initiative because we support equal rights for all, and because we believe in prudent investment of city pension funds.

San Franciscans for Responsible Investments
Julianne Malveaux, Chair
Essie Mornen, Co-Chair
Henry Clark, Co-Chair
Arlo Hale Smith, Treasurer

Hon. Sala Burton
Hon. Harry Britt
Hon. Doris Ward
Hon. Richard Hongisto
Hon. Nancy Walker
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Louis Hopp Lee
Kim Corsaro
Roberto Hernandez
Bruce St. Cyr
Tim Lennon
Beatrice Eisman
Joan Apodaca
Wardell Jackson
Susan Englander
Henry Der
Sue Hestor
Ida Strickland
Bradford Paul
Daniel Moses
National Labor Relations
Board Union Local 20

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

By supporting Proposition J, San Franciscans join citizens from fourteen other cities, including Washington, D.C., Boston, and Berkeley, in removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa. Our support strikes a blow against the apartheid policy that has denied Black and non-white people equal rights in South Africa.

Removing pension funds from South Africa makes good economic sense. International investment advisors recommend against such investment because of the frailty of the South African political situation. Significantly, none of the cities that have divested funds from South Africa have had lower earnings since divestment.

It is both morally just and fiscally sound to vote YES for Proposition J!

Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Economics
S.F. State University
Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud that we were the first state in the nation to vote to sell from our public pension fund portfolio all investments in firms doing business in South Africa. Since the passage of this landmark legislation, it has been our experience that divestiture makes not only a strong moral statement against apartheid, but divestiture has proven to have had no negative impact on our pension earnings.

I urge San Franciscans to give serious consideration to both the moral and the financial arguments as you consider divestiture as a policy of your great city.

Michael Dukakis
Governor, Massachusetts
Submitted by John Burke

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

For over a decade individuals and institutional investors, including local and state governments, universities, foundations, churches, Taft-Hartley pension funds and health and welfare plans have refused to invest in, and divested from corporations and financial institutions economically supporting apartheid in South Africa.

They are investing and earning competitive returns in housing, small business, alternative energy, and other socially productive investments which create employment and prevent capital from being exported to South Africa.

It is fiduciarily irresponsible to risk beneficiaries' pension assets by investing in companies in South Africa.

Many trade and corporate risk analysts have recommended no investment exposure in South Africa. The Rockefeller Study Commission on U.S. policy toward Southern Africa, recently recommended no new corporate investments in that white, minority ruled country.

Vote to create jobs, housing and small business in your community, not apartheid in South Africa. Vote YES on Proposition J.

John Harrington, President
Working Assets Money Fund

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

“For the sake of the children of all South Africans, black and white, for God's sake, for the sake of world peace, the international community must take action, it must exert pressure on South Africa—political pressure, diplomatic pressure and above all, economic pressure.” (Bishop Desmond Tutu, General Secretary-South African Council of Churches, 1981)

The apartheid system continues because of Western support. The South African Council of Churches has said “foreign investors must know they are investing to buttress one of the most vicious systems since Nazism.” As members of the international religious community, we can no longer let others make decisions which contradict all that we believe in. We urge San Franciscans to vote yes on Proposition J as a specific, responsible way to express their moral rejection of apartheid.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I support Proposition J and encourage a statewide effort to remove pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON “J”

STATEMENT BY UNION OFFICIALS

The United Nations General Assembly declared South African apartheid “a crime against humanity”; and that investment in South Africa “encourages the apartheid policies of that country”.

Representatives of several hundred million unionists, meeting under UN -ILO auspices, called for the elimination of stocks of companies investing in South Africa, from pension funds.

As unionists and human rights advocates we support this measure.

Lia Belli
Democratic Candidate,
State Senate

Committee for International Support of Trade Union Rights
Charles Lamb
Anthony L. Ramos
Jack Goldberger
Curtis Mc Clain
Frank Souza
Stanley M. Smith
Mary Anne Petersen
Timothy J. Twomey
Walter L. Johnson
Jack Henning

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

To protect American interests and to halt the spread of Communist influence into South Africa, responsible action is needed to end legally-required racial segregation and to reasonably extend voting rights.

Proposition J is an important step towards a moderate solution of the South African problem.

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman

Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Todd Rosit
Republican State Senate Nominee
Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

WARNING TO VOTERS

Disregard any self-serving statements by Peter Ashe, Meta Stanley, and their controversial Retirement Board in connection with Proposition J.

The Retirement Board has done more than just aid South Africa by its investment policies.

The Retirement Board has made serious investment errors, produced poor investment yields, and run up market value investment portfolio losses of $160,852,320 (as of 3/30/84) with Prudential-Bache.

Mike Garza
Robert Silvestri
Max Woods

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Rainbow Coalition and all members, support this initiative. Stop investments of San Francisco pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. Support Human Rights. People have a right to know that their pension funds are being used to support a racist, repressive, apartheid system, that denies basic human and civil rights to 24 million Africans. We have a right to know that a Black man can be detained in the South African penal system for as long as two years, for not having identification. That Black people there are denied the right to vote, buy or sell land, and the right to live or work where they choose. Support Human Rights. Vote in favor of prop. J.

Gale White
African American of the Rainbow
Rev. Howard Gloyd
Northern California Chairman
The Rainbow Coalition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco CISPES supports the removal of city pension fund investments from firms that profit from apartheid.

The government of South Africa, like the government of El Salvador, denies its people the most basic human rights: freedom from arbitrary arrest and torture; freedom of speech and association; and the right to a decent standard of living.

In 1983, San Franciscans said no to military aid to El Salvador. In 1984, let us say no to investments in South Africa.

San Francisco Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Apartheid continues to be used to enslave black working people in South Africa. International labor has consistently condemned apartheid, and agrees that divestment from South Africa is an effective means of pressure.

David Aroner, Executive Director
SEIU Local 535
Timothy Twomey, Secretary-Treasurer
Hospital and Institutional Workers
Local 250
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director
United Public Employees Local 390/400
SEIU

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For the Black majority, apartheid in South Africa means no right to vote, unionize or speak out. Those who resist are murdered, tortured and imprisoned. Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, has been imprisoned for over twenty years. Apartheid is fascism!

U.S. companies investing in South Africa profit from low wages paid to Black workers, and play a key role in keeping apartheid alive. Say NO to apartheid and racism—Vote YES on Prop J.

Henry Clark, Candidate for
Congress, Fifth Congressional District
Gloria La Riva
All-Peoples' Congress
Johnnie Stevens
Southern Africa Freedom Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Joint Council of the Service Employees International Union has unanimously endorsed this proposal. The Union took this action because of the economic oppression of citizens by the South African Government, because of the termination of trade union rights and the arrest of union leaders, and because of the moral “Crime against humanity” of Apartheid.

Timothy J. Twomey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

South African apartheid is condemned the world over. Even the Reagan Administration expresses opposition. Yet South Africa and apartheid continue to flourish, subjecting all non-whites to the vilest humiliations, discrimination, and exploitation.

San Francisco supports apartheid through our investment of municipal pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. By their very presence there, these companies maintain the status quo. Otherwise, the ruling white minority would not welcome these investments! We allow apartheid to continue, despite all the rhetoric we direct at South Africa.

San Franciscans can make responsible investments elsewhere. Voting YES on J, we join other cities in cutting the taproot—foreign finance— which allows the horrors of South Africa to go on, and on, and on... End it! Vote YES, against apartheid!

Executive Committee
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY A PROPOSITION OF ISSUING REVENUE BONDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.312 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $104,000,000 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, FINANCING, IMPROVING AND DEVELOPING WATER DEPARTMENT FACILITIES; AND CONSOLIDATING SAID SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 1984.

WHEREAS, Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the Board of Supervisors in each instance, the Public Utilities Commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities of the San Francisco Water Department subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of Charter Section 7.300, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco by resolution No. 84-0363 adopted July 24, 1984, pursuant to said Section 7.312, has recommended that the Board of Supervisors, by resolution, submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held for that purpose on November 6, 1984, the proposition of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, as it read on June 5, 1984, and Charter Section 7.312 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission in said resolution 84-0363;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

Section 1. A special revenue bond election is hereby ordered and will be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 6, 1984, at which election there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County the proposition of issuing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of providing funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, all as set forth in the following proposition:

Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds

Shall the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to Charter Section 7.312 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing additions, betterments and improvements to the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system, including filtration and treatment works and plants, reservoirs and other water supply, storage and distribution facilities, lands and equipment necessary or convenient for the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system?

Section 2. Said revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 (herein called the "Bonds") are proposed to be issued to finance improvements to an enterprise (herein called the "Enterprise") which is herein defined to be the City and County of San Francisco municipal water supply, storage and distribution systems of the San Francisco Water Department, including all of the presently existing municipal water system of the City and County and all additions, betterments, extensions and improvements thereto. Said existing water system and the proposed improvements thereto shall constitute a single, unified integrated enterprise, and the revenues therefrom shall be pledged to the payment of the bonds. It is hereby found and determined that said municipal water system is necessary to enable the City and County to exercise its municipal powers and functions, namely, to furnish sufficient water for any present or future beneficial use of the City and County.

(a) The purpose for which the Bonds are proposed to be issued is to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, including any expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith.

(b) The estimated costs of the acquisition, construction, financing, improvement and development is $104,000,000. Said estimated cost includes all costs and expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, engineering, inspection, legal and fiscal agents' fees, cost of the revenue bond election and of the issuance of the Bonds, bond reserve funds, and working capital and bond interest estimated to accrue during the construction period and for a period of not to exceed 12 months after completion of construction.

(c) The maximum principal amount of the Bonds proposed to be issued is $104,000,000.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at said special revenue bond election the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution, and designates and refers to said proposition in the form of ballot hereinafter prescribed for use at said election.

(a) Said special revenue bond election shall be held and conducted, and the votes thereafter canvassed and the returns thereof made, and the result thereof ascertained and determined as herein provided; and in all particulars not described by this resolution, said special election shall be held and the votes canvassed pursuant to law for general municipal elections in the City and County and pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 52 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) All persons qualified to vote at municipal elections in the City and County upon the date of the election herein provided for shall be qualified to vote upon the proposition submitted at said special revenue bond election.

(c) Said special revenue bond election is hereby consolidated with the general municipal election to be held in the City and County on November 6, 1984, pursuant to the Charter of the City and County. The precincts, polling places and officers of election for said special revenue bond election shall be the same as those established.
and designated for said general municipal election. Reference is hereby made to the notice of election by the Registrar of Voters setting forth the precincts, polling places and officers of election for said general municipal election, to be published on or about October 13, 1984 for more particular description of said precincts, polling places and officers of election.

(d) The ballot used at said general municipal election and said special revenue bond election hereby consolidated therewith shall have printed thereon, in addition to all other matters required by law, the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution.

(e) Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

If and to the extent that voting machines are used at said special revenue bond election such machines shall be so arranged that any qualified voter may vote for said proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "YES" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on card, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for said proposition, and may vote against it by pulling down a lever over the word "NO" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on card, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote against said proposition. The statement of said proposition appearing on card, paper or other material used in voting machines shall read substantially as follows:

$104,000,000 San Francisco Water Department Revenue Bonds.

Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with law.

Section 4. If the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution shall be authorized by the qualified voters of the City and County by the votes of a majority of all the voters voting on said proposition, the Bonds may be issued and sold for the purpose set forth in Section 2 of this resolution.

The Bonds are to be revenue bonds, payable exclusively from the revenues of the Enterprise and such other funds from any source as may be legally available for such purpose and may be used by the City and County for such purpose without incurring indebtedness. The Bonds are not to be secured by the taxing power of the City and County, and shall be issued under Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County. The principal of and interest on the Bonds and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof shall not constitute a debt of the City and County, nor a legal or equitable pledge, charge, lien or encumbrance upon any of its property, or upon any of its income, receipts or revenues except the revenues of the Enterprise and any other funds that may be legally applied, pledged or otherwise made available to their payment. The Bonds, if authorized, shall be special obligations of the Public Utilities Commission and shall be secured by a pledge and shall be a charge upon, and shall be payable, as to the principal thereof, interest thereon, and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof, solely from and secured by a lien upon the revenues of the Enterprise and such funds as may be described in the resolution authorizing the issuance of the Bonds.

The Bonds shall not constitute or evidence indebtedness of the City and County but shall constitute and evidence only an indebtedness of the Public Utilities Commission payable solely out of revenues received by the Public Utilities Commission from San Francisco Water Department facilities operated or controlled by it. The Bonds shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in Section 6.401 of the Charter.

Section 5. This resolution shall be printed in the voters' pamphlet and mailed to each registered voter pursuant to Section 9.105 of the Charter of the City and County.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C, Continued from page 61
traffic safety education;
(b) to receive, study and give prompt attention to complaints relating to street design or traffic devices or the absence thereof;
(c) to collect, compile, analyze and interpret traffic and parking data and to analyze and interpret traffic accident information;
(d) to engage in traffic research and traffic planning; and
(e) to cooperate for the best performance of these functions with any department and agency of the city and county and the state as may be necessary.

The department shall submit to the traffic bureau of the police department, for its review and recommendation, all proposed plans relating to street traffic control devices; provided, however, that the bureau may waive submission and review of plans of particular devices designated by it. Failure of the said traffic bureau to submit to the department its recommendation on any proposed plan within fifteen (15) days after receipt shall be considered an automatic approval of said traffic bureau. The department shall not, with respect to any traffic control device, implement such plan until the recommendation of the traffic bureau has been reviewed or until the fifteen (15) day period has elapsed.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telecommunication system of the city and county upon paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way interfere or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendation of the chief of the department.

Department of Public Health, which shall be administered by a director of health, who shall be a regularly licensed physician of the State of California, with not less than 10 years' practice in the profession immediately preceding his appointment. The director, provided he proves that the physician is of the required qualifications, may be appointed by the board of supervisors. He shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at the pleasure of the office of secretary of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

The chief administrative officer shall have power to appoint and to remove an assistant director of public health for hospital services, who shall be responsible for the administration and business management of the institutions of the department of public health, including, but not limited to, the San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Home, Hessett Health Home, and the Emergency Hospital Service, and who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of assistant director of public health for hospital services shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the institutions of the department of public health.

The director of public health shall have power to appoint and remove an administrator of San Francisco General Hospital who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of administrator shall be held only by a physician or hospital administrator who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the San Francisco General Hospital.

Health Advisory Board. There is hereby created a health advisory board of seven members, three of whom shall be physicians and one dentist, all regularly certified. Members of the board shall serve without compensation. They shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer for terms of four years, provided, however, that those first appointed shall classify themselves by lot so that the terms of one physician and one lay member shall expire in 1922, 1924 and 1925, respectively, and the term of one member in 1926. Such board shall consider and report on problems and matters under the jurisdiction of the department of public welfare and shall advise with and make recommendations to the director of health relative to the functions and duties of the department. The recommendations of such board shall be made in writing to the director of health and to the chief administrative officer.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center.

If in the election of June 3, 1958, November 6, 1964, two or more propositions amending section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

PART TWENTY-ONE: HEALTH COMMISSION 3.695 Composition of Department; Commission

The public health department shall consist of a health commission, a director of public health and such employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter. The department shall be under the management of a health commission consisting of seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor. Said commission shall meet less than a majority of direct providers of health care. Direct providers of health care shall mean all
health professionals and others whose “primary current activity” is the provision of patient care or the administration of facilities or institutions which provide patient care. The term of each member of the commission shall be four years, commencing at twelve o’clock, noon, on the 15th day of January in the year 1985; provided, that the respective terms of office of those first appointed shall be as follows: two for four years, two for three years, two for two years, and one for one year. Vacancies occurring on said commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of each of said members shall be filled by the mayor. No commissioner may serve more than two consecutive terms or a total of eight years.

The compensation of each commissioner shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month. The commissioners shall annually elect one of their members president. They shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the governance of the commission.

3.696 Director of Public Health; Other Executives

The health commission shall appoint a director of public health who shall serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The director of public health shall be a regularly licensed physician in the State of California, with not less than five years’ experience in public health administration immediately preceding his or her appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician requirement may be waived by the health commission. The director of public health shall be the chief executive of the commission and shall, subject to the approval of the commission, manage all operations under its jurisdiction. The director shall have power to appoint and remove a deputy director for operations, a deputy director for community health programs, an administrator for San Francisco General Hospital and an administrator for Laguna Honda Hospital. The administrators of San Francisco General Hospital and of Laguna Honda Hospital shall have power to appoint and remove associate administrators to the extent such positions are created by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

These positions shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter and shall be held by persons who possess the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the divisions and institutions of the department. However, any person who has civil service status in any of the above positions on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have such status under the civil service provisions of this charter. All positions in the department legally authorized shall be continued and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.697 Powers and Duties

The health commission shall manage and control the city and county hospitals, emergency medical services, and all matters pertaining to the preservation, promotion, and protection of the lives, health and mental health of the inhabitants of the city and county, except where this charter specifically grants that power to another department. It may also determine the nature and character of public health nuisances and provide for their abatement.

The commission shall inspect the sanitary conditions of the municipal institutions of the city and county, including jails and all public buildings; of the disposition of the dead; of the disposition of garbage, offal and offensive substances.

The commission shall be a policy-making and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in section 3.500 of this charter. The commission shall have the power to establish and make appointments to advisory committees as it shall deem necessary.

8.107 Suspension and Removal

Any elective officer, and any member of the civil service commission, health commission, or public utilities commission or school board may be suspended by the mayor and removed by the board of supervisors for official misconduct, and the mayor shall appoint a qualified person to discharge the duties of the office during the period of suspension. On such suspension, the mayor shall immediately notify the supervisors thereof in writing and the cause therefor, and shall present written charges against such suspended officer to the board of supervisors at or prior to its next regular meeting following such suspension, and shall immediately furnish copy of same to such officer, who shall have the right to appear with counsel before the board in his defense. Hearing by the supervisors shall be held not less than five days after the filing of written charges. If the charges are deemed to be sustained by not less that a three-fourths vote of all members of the board, the suspended officer shall be removed from office; if not so sustained, or if not acted on by the board of supervisors within thirty (30) days after the filing of written charges, the suspended officer shall thereby be reinstated.

The mayor must immediately remove from office any elective official convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, and failure of the mayor so to act shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part.

Any appointee of the mayor, exclusive of civil service, health, recreation and park, and public utilities commissioners, and members of the school board, may be removed by the mayor. Any nominee or appointee of the mayor whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, except the chief administrative officer and the controller, as in this charter otherwise provided, may be removed by a majority of such board and with the concurrence of the mayor. In each case, written notice shall be given or transmitted to such appointee of such removal, the date of effectiveness thereof, and the reasons therefor, a copy of which notice shall be printed at length in the journal of proceedings of the board of supervisors, together with such reply in writing as such official may make. Any appointee of the mayor or the board of supervisors guilty of official misconduct or convicted of crime involving moral turpitude must be removed by the mayor or the board of supervisors, as the case may be, and failure of the mayor or any supervisor to take such action shall constitute official misconduct on his or their part.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F — Continued from page 69

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

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

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

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

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

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

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

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

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

Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of sixty years, shall be entitled to receive under subsection G (g) hereof, subject to the provisions of the formula provided in said subsection G (g), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said subsection G (g). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of sixty years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty years, computed under subsection G (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection G (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed seventy-five percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this section or subsection G (c) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his retirement, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits provided, however, that at any time within thirty days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of sixty-five years may elect, without right to revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month upon retirement after thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty years, and provided further that as to any member within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for
each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

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

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

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

1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection E (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member’s estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member’s contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member’s estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

F. (f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system,
provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least ten years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000), he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, ninety 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus one and two-thirds (1-2/3) percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

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

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

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7-1/2) percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection G (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

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

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision § (a), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of thirty 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provision of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

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

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

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

3 (l) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections D (b), e (c), F (f) and (k) (l) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first-in-effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 3, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1982.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.584-5 Death Benefit
If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause:

(a) If no benefit is payable under Subsection B (b) of this section:

(1) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earned by him during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(2) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earned shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(b) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Section 8.584-2, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years.

If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subsection (b), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subsection (b) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subsection (a) of this section, the amount of said benefit payable under Subsection (a) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subsection (b) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

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

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

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subsection (a) of this section in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this section, for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so
made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

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

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

Upon the death of a member after retirement, an allowance, in addition to the death benefit provided in the immediately preceding paragraph, shall be paid to his surviving spouse, until such surviving spouse's death or remarriage, equal to one-half of his retirement allowance as it was prior to optional modification and prior to reduction as provided in Subsection (a) of Section 8.514 of this charter, but exclusive of the part of such allowance which was provided by additional contributions. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this paragraph to a surviving spouse unless such surviving spouse was married to said member at least one year prior to his retirement. If such retired person leaves no such surviving spouse, or if such surviving spouse should die or remarry before every child of such deceased retired person attains the age of eighteen years, the allowance which such surviving spouse would have received had he or she lived and not remarried shall be paid to retired person's child or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION G**

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

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 twelve 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 one-year (twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the date 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 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four 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 thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated in his position without prejudice, and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of his the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which he that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotive classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall 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.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION H**

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments.

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the Board of Supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its
duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in Section 3.531 of this Charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefore shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in Section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month now provided in Subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in Section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by Section 8.561 of this Charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may award any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, the such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in Subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall
be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter. For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salaried attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation carnable" as used in section 8,549.

The term "firemen" "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective rate of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8,361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers or firemen; firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the fire department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uni-
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name _________________________________________________
Address _____________________________________________ Apt. # _____
Telephone No. (required) ____________________________________________
Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □
Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s): _____________________________
Second choice locations (if any) ______________________________________
Signature _________________________________________________________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER’S BALLOT
APPLICATION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

I hereby apply for an absent voter’s ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:

Mailing address, if different from above
Dirección Postal (si es diferente):

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:

Signature: __________________________
Firma: __________________________

Date: __________________________
Fecha: __________________________

If two persons in your household are requesting absentee ballots, you may put both postcard forms into an envelope in order to save postage.

The disabled may apply as permanent absentee voters by completing the little box at the bottom of the form. Disabilities that qualify for permanent absentee status include circulatory problems and mobility impairments as well as more severe disabilities.

If you have not yet received your absentee ballot, then you are probably not on our permanent absentee mailing list. The permanent absentee voters' ballots were mailed out the week of October 9th.

EXTRA APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Since this page would have been blank anyway, we have used the space to reprint an extra copy of the absentee ballot application form.

Your "real" absentee ballot application appears as a postcard inserted into this book. We would prefer that you use the postcard form because it is easier to process and less likely to get lost.
**GENERAL ELECTION**

5th Congressional District  
17th Assembly District  
(No State Senate)  
(No BART)

**POLL WORKERS NEEDED**

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

**APPLICATION**

Application for absentee ballot appears on Page 48  
Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48  
缺席選票申請表刊在第48頁

**WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:**

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.  
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
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PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the “YES” or after the word “NO”.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATRÁS EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra “SI” o después de la palabra “NO”.

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

選民須知:

選民在投票選舉時，應在選票上劃分所選之候選人姓名。如果有兩名或以上之候選人在同一職位上競選，選民應劃分在選票上所列之候選人姓名，但不可超過所選職位之規定人數。

選舉合格之非選定候選人，應在非選定候選人選票信封所轉的規定位置上寫下該候選人所選職位和姓氏的姓名。

選民任何的 maté，在選票上所列之 “YES” 或 “NO” 字樣打孔。

選票上如有弄污或洗掉等，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打錯，選票作廢了；或者在非選定候選人選票信封內，應把該選票退回選舉委員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
### President and Vice President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMA WONG MAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. MONDALE</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALDINE A. FERRARO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BERGLAND</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES A. LEWIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB RICHARDS</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN KENNEDY SALAMAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK, Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA, Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(There is no contest for State Senator in this District)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal.)
本區沒有州參議員選舉。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</th>
<th>州衆議員</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member of the State Assembly</strong></td>
<td><strong>州衆議員</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17th District</strong></td>
<td><strong>請選一名</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR., Democratic</strong></th>
<th><strong>71 →</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker, California Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orador, Asamblea de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LEE S. DOLSON, Republican</strong></th>
<th><strong>73 →</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maestro de Universidad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.

MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES  
Member, Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Community Service Attorney</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Administrator</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrador de Servicios de Salud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT D. INGRAHAM</td>
<td>Political Consultant</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultor Político</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR M. DAVIS</td>
<td>Hi-Tech Business Woman</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mujer de Negocios / Campo Tecnológico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td>Management Consultant</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultor Administrativo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE B. KENNEDY</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Musico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP</td>
<td>Attorney / Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado / Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SALEH ABDULLA</td>
<td>Real Estate Salesman</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vendedor de Bienes y Raices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUZANNE ALBERTO</td>
<td>Administrative Secretary</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretaria Administrativa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE RENNE</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Political Scientist / Educator</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Especialista en Ciencias Políticas / Educador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIANNE MALVEAUX</td>
<td>Economics Professor / Writer</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profesor de Economía / Escritor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN L. MOLINARI</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important:
There are two (2) pages of candidates for Supervisor.
(29 candidates, vote for 6)

NOTE
29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.

(Contest Continued on Next Page)  
(Continua en la seguiente pagina)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS</td>
<td>Executor</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>RUBY T. JIMENEZ</td>
<td>Directory Sales Representative</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY ANDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>SFCC Student</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>HARRY BRITT</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>RANDALL BRONNER</td>
<td>Artist, Musician</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>JONATHAN BULKLEY</td>
<td>Architect, Neighborhood Planner</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>ROGER BOSCHETTI</td>
<td>T.V. Ethnic Producer</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>KEVIN STARR</td>
<td>Businessman, Communicator, Prof</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>CAROL RUTH SILVER</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>DAVID C. SMITH</td>
<td>Administrator, Service Agency,</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>JOHN E. WAHL</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Writer, Socialist Action</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>Parent and Teacher Maestra y Madre de Familia</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant Contador Público / Consultor Financiero</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>Consultant 質問</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE S. HOPP</td>
<td>Incumbent 現任教委員</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICK CERBATOS</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education Meembro, Junta de Educación 教育委員</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON</td>
<td>Supervisor, Muni Railway Supervisor, Tranvías Municipales 市营公共车监督</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Incumbent 現任教委員</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBBY DENEBEIM</td>
<td>Incumbent 現任教委員</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE DYKSTRA</td>
<td>Community Services Director Director de Servicios Comunitarios 社区服务主任</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>Motor Truck Operator Conductor de Camiones 货车司机</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Community College Board</td>
<td>Vote for no more than 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ERNEST “CHUCK” AYALA</strong></td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>現任社區大學董事</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEAN GOODMAN</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maestro/Actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>教師／演員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</strong></td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Central Committeeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro del Comité Central del Condado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>縣中央委員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANDRE F. PEHARGOU</strong></td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funcionario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>公務員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOY VELASQUEZ</strong></td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>教授</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMOS C. BROWN</strong></td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>現任社區大學董事</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULIE TANG</strong></td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>現任社區大學董事</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIM WOLFRED</strong></td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, Board of Directors, BART District 9</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARON A. VIEIRA</strong></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Technician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecnico en Computadoras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>電腦技術員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RODNEY JOHNSON</strong></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>律師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOHN H. KIRKWOOD</strong></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director de BART</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>灣區捷運系統董事</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>State School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1984.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance Cleanup Bond Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Veterans Bond Act of 1984.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Senior Center Bond Act of 1984.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Property Taxation. Fire Protection Systems Exclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Supreme Court. Transfer of Causes. Review of Decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NÚMERO</td>
<td>VOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT. DISABLED PERSON. Authorizes Legislature to postpone property tax payments on owner occupied principal residence by disabled person. Fiscal Impact: State expenditures estimated to be less than $2 million annually which would be recovered, with interest, when the homes are sold.

YES 210
NO 211

PROPERTY TAXATION. HISTORIC STRUCTURE EXCLUSION. Excludes from property tax reassessment certain new construction on owner occupied principal residence historic structures. Fiscal Impact: Local governments property tax revenue loss of less than $100,000 annually. State government expenditure of about 32% of this to compensate local school districts for property tax revenue losses.

YES 214
NO 215

(Proposition 35 has been withdrawn from the ballot)

TAXATION. Amends Proposition 13 adding restrictions on real property taxation, new tax measures, and charging fees. Provides specified tax refunds. Fiscal Impact: State revenues reduced at least $100 million, net, over first two-year period. State costs increased up to $750 million over first two-year period and by about $150 million annually in subsequent years to replace revenue losses to schools. Local agencies other than schools property tax and other revenue losses of about $2.8 billion, net, over first two-year period and of about $1.1 billion annually in subsequent years.

YES 223
NO 224

STATE LOTTERY. Establishes state-operated lottery. Revenue use: prizes, 50%; expenses, not more than 16%; public education, at least 34%. Fiscal Impact: Cannot be predicted with certainty. Estimated yield for public education would be about $500 million annually, with less the first two years. Estimated division: K-12, 80%; Community Colleges, 13%; California State University, 5%; University of California, 2%.

YES 228
NO 229

VOTING MATERIALS. ENGLISH ONLY. Requires Governor urge federal officials amend law so that voting materials be printed in English only. Fiscal Impact: Insignificant.

YES 232
NO 233
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33 POSTERGACIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. PERSONAS INHABITADAS. Autoriza a la Legislatura a posponer la fecha de cobro del impuesto a la propiedad sobre residencias que estén habitadas por una persona que sea una persona inhabilitada. Impacto fiscal: aumenta el número de unidades de vivienda en la ciudad sin censos, lo que puede conducir a una disminución de los ingresos fiscales. La propuesta no se usará en esta elección.

34 FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE ES- STRUCTURA HISTÓRICA. Excluye del recaudación del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas construcciones o trabajos nuevos efectuados en residencias que son estructuras históricas ocupadas por sus dueños como el principal lugar de residencia. Impacto fiscal: Pérdidas para los gobiernos locales en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad de menos de $100,000 anuales. Gastos gubernamentales estatales alrededor del 32% de esta suma para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida de ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad.

35 La Proposición número 35 no será usada en esta elección.

36 FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. Enmienda la Proposición 13 reduciendo el impuesto a la propiedad inmueble, nuevas mediciones de impuestos y honorarios a cobrar. Disponen rembolso específicos de impuestos. Impacto fiscal: Reducción en los ingresos estatales en por lo menos $100 millones netos, lo que puede llevar a un déficit en el presupuesto. El aumento en los costos fiscales de hasta $750 millones durante el primer periodo de dos años y en un $500 millones anuales en años subsecuentes para reemplazar la pérdida de ingresos para las escuelas. Pérdida para otras agencias locales, además de para las escuelas, del impuesto a la propiedad y otras pérdidas de ingresos de alrededor de $2.8 mil millones anuales, durante el primer periodo de dos años y de alrededor de $1.1 mil millones anualmente en años subsecuentes.

37 LOTERÍA ESTATAL. Establece una lotería operada por el estado. Uso de los ingresos: premios, el 50%; gastos, no más del 16%; educación pública, por lo menos el 34%. Impacto fiscal: No puede ser predicho con certeza. El rendimiento calculado para la educación pública será de alrededor de $500 millones anuales, siendo menor los dos primeros años. División se calcula: jardín de infantes al 12º grado, el 80%; universidades de la comunidad, el 13%; Universidad Estatal de California, el 5%; Universidad de California, el 2%.

38 MATERIALES DE VOTACIÓN. INGLÉS SOLAMENTE. Requiere que el Gobernador urja a los oficiales federales a que emitan la ley para que los materiales para votación sean impresos en inglés solamente. Impacto fiscal: insignificante.
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REAPPORTIONMENT. Provides reapportioning Senate, Assembly, Congressional, Equalization districts for 1986 and subsequent elections by new commission composed of former justices. Fiscal Impact: Commission costs of up to $3.5 million before 1986 election. Costs of $10,000 to $20,000 each to relocate an unknown number of district legislative offices. County costs of about $500,000 for 1986 election materials. County savings of about $300,000 in 1986 for printing costs, and $200,000 every two years thereafter. Future reapportionments will probably cost less than under existing law.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS. Limits contributors and contributions to elective state office candidates. Opposition candidate’s personal expenditures matched by limited public funding. Fiscal Impact: Reduce state revenues by about $100,000 each fiscal year and increase state expenditures by approximately up to $1,650,000 each fiscal year.

PUBLIC AID, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS. Creates Public Assistance Commission. Limits benefit expenditures to national average plus 10%. Legislative amendments permitted. Fiscal Impact: Net effect would be combined state and county expenditure reduction beginning July 1, 1986. Size of reduction and impact at different levels of government impossible to determine. Substantial reductions under specified programs would be partially offset to an unknown extent by increased costs under other programs and reduced tax revenues resulting from reduced federal expenditures within the state. Likely, state expenditures would be reduced and county expenditures increased.

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?  YES 253  NO 254

B Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?  YES 256  NO 257

C Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?  YES 259  NO 260
REDISTRIBUCIÓN. Dispone redistribución para los distritos del
Senado, Asamblea, Congreso y de la Junta de Revision de Avalúos
para 1986 y para las elecciones subsiguientes mediante nueva
comisión compuesta de anteriores jueces. Impacto fiscal: Costos
del comité de hasta $3,5 millones antes de la elección de
1986. Ahora para el comité alrededor de $300,000 por
matrales para la elección de 1986. Los activos de salda
adentro alrededor de $500,000 para materiales
para la elección de 1986. Aunque para el comité alrededor de
$m300,000$ en 1986 por costos de impresión y $200,000 cada
dos años de allí adelante. Las redistribuciones futuras
probablemente costarán menos que bajo la ley actual.

CONTRIBUCIONES PARA COMPAÑÍAS. Limita a los con-
tribuidores y las contribuciones a candidatos a cargos
políticos electivos, iguala con fondos públicos limita-
tados los gastos personales del candidato a oposi-
tión. Impacto fiscal: Reduce los ingresos estatales
en unos $100,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal y
aumenta los gastos estatales en aproximadamente
hasta $1,650,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal.

AYUDA PÚBLICA, PROGRAMAS DE ASISTENCIA MÉDICA. Creó Com-
misión de Asistencia Pública. Limita gastos de beneficios al 60%
medio nacional más el 10%. Permite emmídas legistas.
Impacto fiscal: el efecto neto sería la reducción de los gastos
combinados del estado y condado comenzando el 1° de julio de
1986. El tamaño de la reducción y su impacto en los diferentes
niveles del gobierno es imposible determinar hasta este momento.
Reduciones substanciales bajo Programas específicos serían
particularmente compensadas hasta un grado desconocido mediante
el aumento de gastos bajo otros programas y por ingresos de
impuestos reducidos que resulten de gastos federales reducidos
dentro del estado. Es factible que los gastos estatales serían
reducidos y que los gastos de condados aumentarían.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

¿Debe autorizar la Comisión del Puerto a emitir
$42,500,000 de bonos de ingresos para financiar la
construcción y mejoras de las instalaciones portuarias?

¿Debe autorizar a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos
to emitir $104,000,000 en bonos de ingresos para
financiar la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones
para el Departamento de Aguas?

¿Debe crear una Comisión de Salud que consista
de siete miembros nombrados por el Alcalde para
dirigir y controlar los hospitales de la Ciudad y el
Condados, y para nombrar un Director de Salud Pública?
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D  Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?  
   YES 261  NO 262

E  Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?  
   YES 264  NO 265

F  Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?  
   YES 267  NO 268

G  Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?  
   YES 270  NO 271

H  Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?  
   YES 274  NO 275

I  (Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?  
   YES 278  NO 279

J  (Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and Black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?  
   YES 283  NO 284
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D. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Jubilaciones a hacer inversiones de los fondos de jubilación como persona prudente en lugar de hacer inversiones de carácter legal para compañías de seguros?

E. ¿Deberá la Ciudad subvencionar al cónyuge sobreviviente de empleados activos o retirados de la misma manera que la Ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o retirados en el Sistema de Servicios de la Salud?

F. ¿Deberá pagar un beneficio de doce meses de salario por fallecimiento a diversos oficiales y empleados que mueren como resultado de lesiones físicas externas y violentas durante el transcurso y período de empleo?

G. ¿Deberá el periodo probatorio para oficiales de policía extenderse de un año a partir de su entrada a un año después de haber completado el entrenamiento pero sin exceder ochenta y cuatro semanas?

H. ¿Deberá pagar un salario adicional a los miembros del Departamento de Policía asignados a prestar servicio en todas las motocicletas de dos ruedas?

I. (Ordenanza de Iniciativa): ¿Deberá San Francisco solicitar al Gobierno Federal que pregunte a los contribuyentes de impuestos si desean que una parte de sus impuestos se use para un exceso gasto militar y si desean que la Ciudad publique un informe anual sobre los impuestos federales recaudados en San Francisco y sobre la parte usada para propósitos militares excesivos y la parte usada para necesidades sociales?

J. (Declaración de Norma): ¿Deberá ser la norma de San Francisco que ningún fondo de pensión administrado por la Ciudad sea invertido en empresas que tienen intereses comerciales en Sudáfrica hasta que sea abolida la segregación racial y se otorgue a la población de raza negra plenos derechos políticos y civiles en Sudáfrica?

市府给在職身故或退休後去世的僱員的遺児的保健福利金，應否與在職或退休僱員的津貼相同?

在工作中或在工作範圍內身體遭受暴力引致的外傷而殉職的各類官員和僱員，應否付給十二個月薪額的死亡撫卹金?

應否延長警員的試用期，即從加入警局起一年延至完成訓練後一年的時間，但不能超過八十四個星期?

應否給予警局駕駛兩輪摩托車的警員額外報酬，其數額根據加州有350,000人口的城市此種報酬的平均數而定?

（創制法令）：舊金山應否要求聯邦政府詢求所有納稅人的意見是否願意讓他們的稅款用在過度的軍事費用上，並由市政府每年刊登一份報告，詳列有關聯邦在舊金山徵收稅款，以及用於過度軍事目的和用於社會需要的數額?

（政策聲明）：舊金山應否制訂政策，規定市政府管理的退休基金不能投資在與南非有商業關係的商號，直至南非廢除種族隔離，給予黑人充分的政治權利和民權為止?
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请双手持票向自动投票机整张选票插入。

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 coincidan con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步
请确认选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之上。

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 perfora con el la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
请把带针之选票插入，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

第四步
投票选票之后，把选票取出，放入空白袋内。将尾端插在外。
在封袋上，有空白格预备供投票人应用。
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committe

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered
to vote by October 9, 1984.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of
another political party?
A—At a general election, such as this one, you can vote
for any candidate whose name appears on your
ballot.

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

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this elec-
tion?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature, Supervisors,
B.A.R.T., College Governing Board and Board
of Education.

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

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

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 6, 1984.
Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M.
that day.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Reg-
istrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the
Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must
be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar
of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 6,
1984.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

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

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

**POLLS**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 25 through 41 because in June the numbers were 16 through 24.

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

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

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

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

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

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for BART Board (#9)

RODNEY JOHNSON
My age is 35
My occupation is a lawyer
My education and qualifications are: I am an attorney for Stanford University. Each day I help make decisions on financial matters, lawsuits, personnel issues, and policy for Stanford, which has an operating budget greater than $500 million. This involves matters ranging from running a hospital, to building 1000 units of new housing for faculty and staff. Additionally, I studied transportation while in college.

The BART representative should work for transportation solutions for San Francisco, and not just for BART. Can you find a seat on the bus? A parking place? I not only will work to manage BART more efficiently but also for San Francisco to obtain its fair share of money and consideration from federal, state, and local agencies in solving these problems.

I know the responsibilities of a public official. Elected to the 1978 Charter Commission, I served as its secretary and was appointed by Governor Brown to the regional Coastal Commission. I have worked to improve my neighborhood as a member of the Board of Directors of the Richmond District Neighborhood Center and the S.F. Local Development Corporation.

My endorsers include Assemblyman Art Agnos, former Police Chief Tom Cahill, Supervisors Britt, Silver, and Walker, and former Supervisors Lau and Morrison.

JOHN H. KIRKWOOD
My age is 37
My occupation is BART Director/Incumbent
My education and qualifications are: 13 years experience in transit. Graduate: Lick-Wilmerding, Stanford University. Since my 1974 election to the BART Board, I have consistently pushed BART to improve and function more efficiently. BART has doubled the number of cars in service; increased access for handicapped people and bicyclists; increased on-time performance from 45% to 95%; stopped fare evasion; increased opportunities for minorities and women; kept per-mile costs down; given employees more flexible schedules; and drastically improved fire and safety procedures (BART has run 5 billion passenger miles without a single passenger fatality, the best record in the nation.)

I constantly review transit professional journals and the trade press. I spend countless hours analyzing budgets and operating plans to find errors and false assumptions. My ambition is to be the best possible BART Director, not to seek higher office. If you have questions, call me at 362-2939.

My supporters include: Dianne Feinstein, Mayor John Molinari, Supervisor Louise Renne, Supervisor Bill Maher, Supervisor Agnes I. Chan, Former Charter Commissioner Nancy Lenvin, President, Public Utilities Commission Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transportation Commissioner Eugene Garfinkle, BART Director Margaret Pryor, BART Director Arlo Smith, District Attorney Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker, California Assembly

ARON VIEIRA
My age is 21
My occupation is Computer Technician
My education and qualifications are: As a founding member of The Community for Human Development in San Francisco, I am running for this office out of my deep concern for the Board's undemocratic policies and suspicious behavior. Although all of us in District 9 pay for BART few of us are informed about the decisions and operations of the BART Board.

Meetings are not widely publicized. When was the last time you were informed about a BART meeting? In fact the BART Board exercises a monopoly over BART decision making by closing its doors to active citizen participation.

If elected, my first priority will be to Open Up the BART Board meetings to public scrutiny. All meetings will be held at times and places convenient to San Francisco voters.

Public Transportation should be by and for the people!

Humanize the BART!!

Aron Vieira

Rodney Johnson

John H. Kirkwood

Statements printed on this page are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
JOHN SALEH ABDULLA
My address is 2533 Folsom Street
My occupation is Licensed Real Estate Salesman
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: I graduated at a local public high school. I also attended private business schools. I am presently a licensed real estate salesman.

Knowing the city's acute housing and employment problems, I am deeply concerned of the these problems and would like to be in a position to find solutions to these problems. While I have no immediate solutions; if elected, I promise the people of San Francisco that I will devote all of my time to finding solutions to these problems by utilizing all resources available to public officials in solving these problems.

John Saleh Abdulla

The sponsors for John Saleh Abdulla are:
Saleh M. Abdulla, 155 Clipper St., Janitor
Sam Bachman, 238 Eddy St., Janitor
Richard F. Bourdon, 165 Clipper St., Mover
Peter Bury, 555 Post St., Musician
Freddie Cononica, 1419 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Alfred Catalin, 1459 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Bernard Faraoo, 3609-10th St., Deputy Clerk
Robert Fulgham, 487 Joost St., Business Representative
Saleh M. Ghanem, 155 Clipper St., Maintenance
Stephen A. Halbe, 1202-23rd Ave., Musician
Jamal Jawad, 488 Ellis St., Business Owner
Zelma Ann Johnston, 575 O'Farrell St., Retired
Barbara D. Jones, 1421 South Van Ness Ave., Housewife
Alfred E. Kelly, 610 Polk St., Retired Union Official
Yhya S. Mohamed, 640 Eddy St., Maintenance
Brian Charles Percy, 353 Hyde St., Payroll clerk
Charles Ridgell, 347 Lexington St., Business Representative,
Janitors Union
James Roy Sellers, 575 O'Farrell St., Unemployed
Madeline Smith, 159 Clipper St., Housewife
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect

SUZANNE ALBERTO
My address is 25 Pinto Avenue
My occupation is Administrative Secretary
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I am a Hispanic-Filipina (English/Spanish-speaking) administrative-secretarial San Francisco worker and Muni commuter and have been a resident voter since 1968.

I believe San Franciscans would be better served if suitable inquiry and evaluation preceded passage of locally needed and desired legislation and tax revenue expenditures to assure anticipated results. San Francisco's Charter permits supervisorial inquiry into expenditures. I strongly support thoroughly researched legislation and tax revenue use to benefit the peoples of San Francisco.

All of my sponsors know me to be a capable, persistent fighter for principles and public benefit and believe I would be an excellent supervisor.

Suzanne Alberto

The sponsors for Suzanne Alberto are:
L. J. Alberto, 4156-25th St., Communication Technician
Alvin E. Bernstein, 6 Roanoke St., Computer Analyst
David Carlton Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Tape Librarian
Sarah M. Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Programer/analyzer
Rose Violet Desello, 215 Niagara Ave., Retired Bookkeeper
Donna D. Dunlap, 125 DeMonfort Ave., Telecom Specialist
R. L. Feather, 111 Inverness St., Secretary
Angel Fernandez, Jr., 1419-11th Ave., Security Officer
David L. Forks, 26 Shields St., Janitor
Paul F. Garm, 2387-44th Ave., Security Guard
Joyce A. Glyn, 38 Serrano Dr., Legal Secretary
Margery M. Gray-Scheff, 2256-18th Ave., Financial Administrator
Amy J. Kocher, 2006 Fell St., Office Manager
Cheryl Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Housewife
Cheryanne Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Welder
David Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Truck Driver
Ruth Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Housewife
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St., Custodian
Dewey W. McNeil, 251 Topkea Ave., Utility Engineer
Leon Medlin, 1725 Church St., Retired-Laborer
Nathan Nemer, 125 Cambon Dr., Retired-Product Buyer
Patricia J. Powell, 2006 Fell St., Publishing
Petty Randall, 366 Wilde St., Grocery Clerk
Roberto Sampena, 328 Staples Ave., Sr. Drafter
Clifford C. Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Mechanic
Tina Tatro, 464 Ellis St., Clerical
E. L. Thomason, 111 Inverness St., Student
Kenneth E. Tucker, Jr., 243 Hahn St., Building and Grounds Patrolman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROGER BOSCHETTI

My address is 20 Carnelian Way
My occupation is Television Producer, Host, Writer, and Labor Consultant
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of involvement with working men, women, and young people, and as a concerned citizen, I will work to implement laws which will benefit all the people of San Francisco, such as reducing payroll and business tax, so as to encourage small businesses to come or stay in San Francisco, thereby creating more jobs. Will implement constructive changes in muni for speedier, safer and effective service, I will also create better programs to help the needs of our young men and women, I would like more police foot patrol, and more affordable housing, with more concern for our senior citizen

Roger Boschetti

RICHARD BRADLEY

My address is 1 Ardath Court
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As a supporter of the Spartacist League I twice tore down the Confederate flag of slavery which flies no more in Civic Center. The American Civil War did not complete its historic mission. It will take a third American revolution, a socialist revolution, to liberate black people.

Spike Reagan's anti-Soviet war plans and union-busting austerity drive by mass strike action! U.S. imperialism—hands off Central America! Smash Klan/Nazi terror through labor/black action! Break with Democrats—enemies of labor/minorities! Build a workers party that will stop at nothing short of socialist revolution and a workers government!

Richard Bradley

The sponsors for Roger Boschetti are:
William A. Arietta, 16 Wheat St., Police Officer
Rita M. Belli, 1978 Greenwich St., Assessment Clerk
Rachel Boschetti, 20 Carnelian St., Cosmetologist
George Contessi-Turner, 631 O'Farrell St., Instructor/Professor
Bernard M. Crotty, 2971-23rd Ave., City Employee
John E. Downey, 83 Gaviota Way, Nationally Known Referee/Limo Driver/Boxing Judge
Curtis Elliott, 350 Glenview Dr., Doorman
Evelyn C. Fitzgerald, 230 Stonecrest Dr., School Administrator
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Dr., Labor Consultant
Robert Jacobs, 1438-36th Ave., Business Agent
Roger Micheli, 2655 Chestnut St., Goldengate Disposal
Robert T. Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Lieutenant S.F.P.D. Retired
Shirley Robin Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Investigator
Marie G. Neilsen, 319 Maynard St., Businesswoman
Maria Ann Perri, 80 Malta St., Corporate Secretary
Joseph J. Phillips, 1203 Clayton St., Attorney
John E. Ricci, 1324 Broadway, Lawyer
Don L. Rotan, 134 Gilbert St., Writer
Samuel Smith, 297 Allison St., Seaman Cook
Carmen Sollis, 39 Majestic Ave., Restaurant Owner
Rose M. Tarantino, 160 Country Club Dr., Housewife
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
John J. Vidal, Sr., 1437 Judah St., Office Manager
Winston Wong, 225 Anzavista Ave., Manager of American Cab Co.
Herman W. Young, 210 Brookdale Ave., Seaman
Maya Dhillion-Zygaj, 455 Chenery St., Homemaker

The sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikegami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennyse Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomesen, 1841A Church St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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HARRY BRITT
My address is 783A Guerrero Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: As a full-time Supervisor, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making city government respond to our needs.
- I've supported crime-reducing neighborhood patrols to protect seniors;
- fought to repeal the sewer service charge;
- worked to protect the quality of our neighborhoods and environment;
- secured funding for anti-gay violence programs, AIDS prevention, community arts programs;
- sponsored protections for renters and small businesses from skyrocketing rents;
- worked to create affordable housing;
- sponsored equal pay for comparable jobs;
- worked to have downtown pay its share of taxes;
- worked to save jobs when companies moved from San Francisco.

Harry G. Brit

RANDALL DWAYNE BRONNER
My address is 1390 Market Street
My occupation is artist-musician
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: San Francisco Budget Surplus+$162 Million.
Muni Fare/Fast Pass Revenue+$46 Million.
Aspen, Colorado-Free buses ten years.
Portland-Free buses downtown.
We residents pay for more than two thirds of Muni's cost in our taxes. Residents should ride Muni for free!
You must check out the murals supporting Peace in Central America on Balmy Street.
Please call 864-8641 if you'd like to meet the survivors of 1906, free, at the Great Earthquake Exposition.
If you want to brighten up your street call San Francisco Street Gardeners for free cuttings, succulents, and flowers, at the same number.

Randall Bronner

The sponsors for Harry G. Brit are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Sala Burton, 8 Shot Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., State Assemplyman
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 6 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister, Community College Board Member
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Member, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everston St., Performing Arts Administrator
Yori Wada, 505-4th Ave., Regent-University of California
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner, Businessman
Carole Mijeden, 501-28th St., President, Harvey Milk Club
Sal Rosell, 349 Lexington St., President, Alice B. Toklas Club
Wayne Friday, 1095-14th St., Newspaper Political Editor
Tom Murray, 4715 Balboa St., Newspaper Editor
Thomas F. Waldell, M.D. 141 Albion St., Athletic Games Organizer
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Affordable Housing/Tenant's Rights Worker
Edward L. Peet, 350 Arbello Dr., Senior Citizen's Advocate
John Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Sierra Club
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus
Leon Bruschen, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Howard Glyde, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Andrew Jepson, 1334 Masonic Ave., Nuclear Freeze Leader
Philip E. De Andrade, 601 Mississippi St., Small Business Owner
Georgianna Lynn, 165 El Verano St., West Portal Avenue Business Owner
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon St., Registered Nurse

The sponsors for Randall Bronner are:
Selig R. Raphael, 495-32nd Ave., Survivor 1906 Quake
Jane Dornacka, 5 Central Ave., Reporter
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
William T. Witter, 948 Haight St., Artist
James T. Lyon, 1761 Page St., Musician
P. Kelly Hartin, 119 Margaret Ave., Cateress
Julie Tancil, 1653 Washington St., Waitress
Raymundo E. Pena, 1470 Fulton St., Waiter
Mary L. Martinez, 285 Moscony St., Secretary
Sandra Renzi, 801 Post St., Waitress and Prep Work
Giorgio Irving, 1390 Market St., Waiter
Martin James, 1139 Broadway, Bartender
Elizabeth Kelly, 3249 Pierce St., Restaurant Services
Anthony R., Parrinello, 312 Precita Ave., Artist
Carlos Gonzalez, 3409-20th St., Community Worker
Robert Burns, 2500 Folsom St., Carpenter
Susan Cervantes, 398 Precita St., Artist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
James A. Lewis, 3090 Cabrillo St., Artist/Teacher
Julianne Malveaux, 26 Windfield St., Economist
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JONATHAN BULKLEY

My address is 147 Tenth Avenue
My occupation is Architect, Neighborhood Planner
My age is 54

My qualifications for office are: Experienced Architect and Planner. President, Planning Association for the Richmond; Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. Member: Open Space Committee, Mayor’s Task Forces for Parking, Mechanical Amusement Devices and Sidewalk Displays.

My Architecture/Planning background will help me respond to the need for a coherent vision of San Francisco as a City that works for everyone.

My priorities include:
• Housing for those most in need—singles, working women, seniors.
• Crime-free streets
• Civil service preference for San Francisco residents.
• Caring solutions to seniors’ needs.
• Eliminating Bay pollution.
• Maintaining Neighborhood Character, Diversity, and Liveability.

The interests of San Francisco Residents will always come first! Jonathan Bulkley

The sponsors for Jonathan Bulkley are:

Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Tenant Representative, Rent Stabilization Board
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., S.F. Housing Commissioner
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Ter., Former City Planning Commissioner
Lee Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor; Former Supervisor
Jose Luis Fernandini, 404-43rd Ave., Businessman; Vice President, MAPA
Russell B. Flynn, 2610 Filbert St., President, Rent Stabilization Board
Ann Fogelberg, 2980 Vallejo St., Housewife; Vice Pres., Cow Hollow Association
Terry Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney; Former Supervisor
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Public Utilities Commissioner
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer
Ruth Gravani, 74 Mipah St., Glen Park Association
Anne W. Halsted, 1318 Montgomery St., Port Commissioner; Past President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
John Hooper, 201 Buena Vista East, Conservationist; President, Buena Vista Neighborhood Ass’n.
Don Horany, 84 Kalocho Ave., Former Supervisor
John H. Kirkwood, 1635 Green St., Member, BART Board
Bill Kahns, 4215-26th St., Co-Chair, Open Space Committee
Jim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner
Richard Livingston, 380 Eddy St., Administrator, Realty House West; Member, Open Space Committee
Peter McCrea, 1024 Lake St., Businessman; Past Pres., Public Utilities Comm.
Amy Meyer, 3275 Clement St., Rec. & Park Commissioner
William F. O’Keefe, Sr., 444 Corbett Ave., President, S.F. Taxpayers Association
Thomas R. Peretti, 3787-16th St., Banker; President, C.R.I.R.
Alan Raznick, 237 Topaz Way, Attorney; President, Coalition for S.F. Neighborhoods
Toby Rosenblatt, 3409 Pacific Ave., Businessman; Pres., City Planning Commission
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
Sam Valentine, 500 College Ave., Retired; Past President St. Mary’s Park Improvement Club

DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I am a supporter of the Spartacists, the labor/socialists who put a stop to flying the Confederate flag, banner of KKK racism and slavery, in Civic Center. Finish the Civil War! Forward to a workers government!

Without socialist revolution catastrophe threatens mankind. We need an integrated workers party that will take the productive wealth from the capitalistic bosses, and establish a workers government and socialist planned economy.

Spike Reagan reaction through mass strikes! Military victory to Salvadoran leftists! Defend the USSR! No support to Democrats—liberal party of imperialism! Smash Taft-Hartley! Labor’s gotta play hardball to win! Diana Coleman

The sponsors for Diana Coleman are:

Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Richard Bradley, 1 Ardath Ct., Maintenance Building
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lila Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikenagi, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4140-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennye Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student
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ELEANOR M. DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Accounting Services
My qualifications for office are: My experience with community groups and City Hall is extensive.

Involved in local politics through neighborhood and merchant associations, worked on campaigns for Diane Feinstein, and many others. Served the community through the following organizations: Vice President, Clement Merchants, head of legislative committee; Consultant to Polk Merchants; Member, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Roundtable, Vice Chair Health Committee; Board, California Alcohol Treatment Services; Chairperson Alcohol Awareness; Appointee, Mayor's Task Force on Sidewalk Vending, Parking; San Francisco Outlook, Project Manager; Member, SPUR; Boardmember Public Research Institute, SFSU.

A loyal devotee of San Francisco. I will serve honestly with an open mind and heart.

Eleanor M. Davis

EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES

My address is 695 John Muir Drive
My occupation is Banker
My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: Forty-four years after my grandparents were married here in San Francisco just seven months after the nineteen hundred and six earthquake. A beautiful blond hair, blue eyed baby boy came bouncing out of St. Joseph's Hospital. Studying economics at St. Mary's College after attending Riordan and then leaving religious life to create a conservation newspaper. Trying to educate local residents about the serious problems that we faced here in San Francisco and the bay area. If allowed to fulfill my dreams of what we can accomplish I will gladly give twenty-five per cent of my salary to charity.

Edward Michael Hayes

The sponsors for Edward Michael Hayes are:

Edwin B. Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Miriam Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Agnes Cassidy, 385 Day St., Retired
Anna M. d'Ottille, 1356 Dolores St., Housewife
Bertram J. d'Ottille, 1356 Dolores St., Retired
Mary M. Driscoll, 342-28th St., Administrative Assistant
John L. Flynn, 54 Seaview Terr., Banker
Elaine M. Gilligan, 133 Randall St., Banker
Rae Grubstick, 2479-40th Ave., Banker
Marcia Kocel, 4 Mallorea Way, Bank Clerk
Barnee Langley, 460 Duncan St., Retired
Bernadine K. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William G. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William D. MacGillivray, 2720-35th Ave., Banker
Michael J. McCarthy, 3744-22nd St., Retired
Nora S. McManus, 456 Duncan St., Retired
Ellen McSweeney, 457 Duncan St., Retired
Aileen P. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Mary C. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Leona P. Parker, 56 Harper St., Housewife
James L. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Clerk
Janet M. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Secretary
Rita M. Phillips, 230 Prospect Ave., Retired
Eugene F. Sullivan, 456 Duncan St., Ironworker
Catherine C. Tassone, 1795 Sanchez St., Clerk
Nellie Twomey, 1325 Church St., Home-maker
Seymour Whitelaw, 3150 Clay St., Investment Broker
Ann M. Willis, 1365 Dolores St., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT DANIEL INGRAHAM
My address is 1637 Noriega Street
My occupation is Political Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Over one hundred years ago two great men, David Broderick and Edward Baker, gave their lives to save this Republic.
I ask you voters to compare these two San Franciscans with the small minded politicians of today.
Pathetic Wendy Nelder says “Fluoride causes AIDS”; degraded Willie Brown corrupts us with “Oh What a Night” baccalalia; Feinstein lusts for higher office, and the rest are worse.
San Francisco can play an historic role in the development of the Pacific Basin. But you, our citizens, must decide. I urge you: Join with me and other candidates of Lyndon LaRouche’s NDPC in our fight.

Robert Daniel Ingraham

RUBY T. JIMENEZ
My address is 961 Delano Avenue
My occupation is Directory Sales Representative
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: A San Francisco resident since, 1948 and a naturalized American of Mexican decent, I consider myself an earnest interpreter of human needs for the Hispanic community and other minorities. Misinterpretations, injustices, lack of communication and mutual respect must be addressed and aired. These human needs for minorities and others can be solved if we end the current world depression. The humane world economic policies of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly his proposal for joint economic development between the United States and Ibero-America (Operation Juarez) can end this depression. The port of San Francisco should be expanded to become a strong world trade center.

Ruby T. Jimenez

The sponsors for Robert Ingraham are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Phillip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Holward M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortilift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Refiner
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallon St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Carpinano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Refiner
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

The sponsors for Ruby T. Jimenez are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Stanley J. Bolinski, 1909 Eddy St., Staff Clerk
Willa W. Coleman, 215 Munich St., Sales Representative
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
Patricia L. Hardy, 178 Broad St., Assistant Manager
Patricia Helton, 93 Frenzites St., Teacher, Mission Community College
Andrea Konviser Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ors Lee Jones, 359 Orizaba Ave., Staff Clerk
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Carpinano Ave., Housewife
Ruth Mattas, 638 Sawyer St., Office Clerk
Patricia McDonagh, 385-28th St., Housewife
Thomas McDonagh, 385-28th St., Construction
Ruth E. Rosenberg, 165 Parnassus Ave., Instructor
Leticia Wickersham, 171 Precita Ave.
Lupe D. Zamudio, 274 Broad St., Sales Representative

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ANDREW ("DADDY ANDY") JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Criminology Student
My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I have been a respected citizen and server of San Francisco for 25 years. I'm involved in many community organizations that care for our community such as Glide church, Red Cross volunteers and the Singel partents resource center. I've been appointed to sit on the board of such organizations as "Mission Coalition, Mission Model Neighborhood and the Mission Education program, (appointed by Major Alioto and Mayor Moscone). I'd like to dedicate my Supervisory campaign to a few of the many people who helped me over the years, Chef Roy Hammerick, Betty Romenoff and the Mission Childcare Consortium.

Andrew Daddy Andy Jones

WILLIE B. KENNEDY

My address is 950 Duncan Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: In my three years as Supervisor, I have worked to maintain and improve the unique quality of life we have in San Francisco—from rent control to fighting for parks and open spaces. I honor our rich diversity of cultures and life styles through support of neighborhood preservation and the rights of all groups—from children to seniors.

I initiated a campaign to control the tragic increase in child abuse; and am working hard on the problem of decreased employment, particularly for youth.

I want to continue serving your interests in making this the most liveable city in the United States. Willie B. Kennedy

The sponsors for Willie B. Kennedy are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Elected Official, Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member Community College Board

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor/Airport Commissioner
Al Bovice, 234 Gutes St., Attorney At Law
Harry G. Brit, 783-A Guerero St., Member, Board of Supervisors

Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman St., Member, Board of Education
Handy Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant, Commissioner PUC

Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
James C. Horne, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Union Official

Gordon J. Lau, 540-15th Ave., Attorney
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Aldo P. Lera, 1177 California St., Electrical Contractor
Cyril Maginn, 1 Nobhill St., Philanthropist

Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
James McCrory, Jr., 164-6th Ave., Minister

Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Prectica Ave., Administrator
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
Adolph Schuman, 1170 Sacramento St., Businessman

Stan Smith, 15 Harest Ave., Union Official
Yori Wada, 365-4th Ave., U.C. Regent

Nancy G. Walker, 555 Green St., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
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ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 121 Golden Gate Avenue
My occupation is Musician
My qualifications for office are: I am one of many in unity with San Francisco's diversity. I "Keyes" will open doors for you, to: homes, jobs, health care, better schools, provide more: complimentary fine arts, concerts, veterans benefits, senior services; close doors on pornography, drugs and prostitution; clean our streets and make them safe once more; eliminate wasteful spending and lower your taxes. For reasons like these, I am your "Keyes". Never again, will any San Franciscan go wanting, while "special interest" lick their fingers. Let us shine bright, the city that knows how, a guiding light to world peace now.

God help us.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys are:
Gary Gene Adams, 139-5th Ave., Plastic Fabricator
Wayne Austin, 391 Leavenworth St., Job Developer
Brian Chew, 334-30th Ave., Restaurant Worker
Ginger Coyote Coleman, 734 Bush St., Editor of Punk Globe
Hugh T. Dauley, 1177 California St., Computer Operator
Thomas A. Finney, 165 Turk St., Disabled/SSI
Howard M. Grayson, 160 Eddy St., Community Coordinator, Hosp. House
Louis J. Gwerder, 427 Valley St., Laborer
Mickey C. Helmel, 777 Tehama St., Patriot
John R. Hess, 554 Broadway St., Doorman
Kevin M. Kennedy, 250 McAllister St., Social Worker
Patricia E. Kerman, 1026 Montgomery St., Film Maker
John Lyman, 149-6th St., Musician
Patrick Marsh, 231-27th St., Chef
Perry V. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Teacher
Michelle Miller, 15 Surrey St., Student
David M. Moats, 350 Frederick, Symphonic Musician
Keith F. Moog, 1233 Guerrero St., Controller
Gary Posner, 443 Broadway St., Engineer
Steven Present, 373 Ellis St., Security Officer
Clark Sullivan, 765 Ellis St., Political Activist
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Office/Clerical
Robin Vega, 1330 Jessie St., Courier
H. Joseph Wagner, 121 Goldengate Ave., Musician
James E. Washington, Jr. 55 Mason St., Consultant, Arts and Science
Guy West, 640 Polk St., Broadcasting
Linda Marie White, 777 Tehama St., Seamstress

DAVID L. KILBER

My address is 1901 Noriega Street
My occupation is Management Consultant
My age is 40
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of Oregon State University, a Vietnam Veteran, and a former candidate for California State Assembly. I have resided in the Sunset district with my wife Susan for five years.

I stand for a strong defense policy including the Beam Weapon anti-missile defense and the technology boom this new "Apollo" program will bring to the local economy.

San Francisco must become a center for science, classical culture, and trade, bringing blue-collar families and industry back to this city. We must expand the Port of San Francisco and launch the Pacific Basin development strategy proposed by economist Lyndon LaRouche.

David L. Kilber

The sponsors for David L. Kilber are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeny St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeny St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeny St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeny St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 557 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lizzano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Stainiic, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
Edith Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retired
J.G. Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retailer

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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QUENTIN L. KOPP

My address is 68 Country Club Drive
My occupation is Attorney/Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Local government is us, because we depend upon it to provide essential services and wise leadership. For 13 years I’ve fought to cut governmental waste and excessive taxation, to keep government honest and on its toes. My efforts have already saved taxpayers over $250,000,000 and I’m proud to be the one supervisor who watches how every dollar is spent. This year City government will spend an average $4,500,000 a day, every day. I want to continue my role as your “financial watchdog” in City Hall and add a needed balance to the Board. I would very much appreciate your support.

Quentin L. Kopp

The sponsors for Quentin L. Kopp are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Former Mayor
John J. Barbogilia, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Former Member of the Board of Supervisors
A. Marquez Baistna, 1535 Powell St., Attorney at Law
Sal Burton, 8 Stocket Blvd., Member of Congress
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
George Christopher, 170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor
Eleanor Russell Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Businessperson
Robert C. Ellus, 469 Magnolia Ave., Attorney at Law
George Evankovich, 1600-A Greenwich St., Labor Representative
Terry A. Francia, 70 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Jack E. Frankel, 72-22nd Ave., Rabbi
Merle Zellerbuck Geenom, 225 Presidio Ter., Author/Journalist
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Attorney at Law
Carolto Goodlett, 2600 O’Farrell St., Publisher
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author/Retired Publisher
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Sonoracist Dr., Contractor
Golda Kaufman, 2900 Pacific Ave., Homemake/Volunteer
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3030-25th Ave., Congressional Assistant
Joseph P. Lacy, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
John L. Schiavo, 2130 Fulton St., Priest/Educator
Haig G. Marfikian, 2960 Divandare St., Businesswoman
Frances M. McAvoy, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 2151-25th Ave., Retired President of City Employees
John Rjordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Bob Ross, 4200-25th St., Newspaper Publisher
Harriet C. Salamo, 95 Creatack Dr., Self Employed Businesswoman
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Police Commissioner
Dorothy Vukics, 177 San Aleso Ave., Housewife/Volunteer
Benny Y. Yec, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arbello Drive
My occupation is Political Scientist/Educator
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: impressive. A full decade of political activism at national, state, and local levels. Leadership roles in labor, housing, and education. To illustrate my seriousness in leading our City, I have launched the following initiative campaigns:
* A 3-year rent freeze
* Commercial rent control
* A balanced budget
* Expedition of labor disputes
* Driver-ownership of taxicabs
* An outdoor stadium in front of Moscone Center
As your supervisor, I will pursue:
* District elections for district councils
* Metro services for the Richmond, Marina, Bayview
* Higher police standards
* More schools and parks
You need me now, San Francisco! Who else you gonna call?

Julian O. Lagos

The sponsors for Julian Lagos are:
Charles Martin Adams, 54 4th St., Cab Driver
Scherrie Rue Ahonen, 577 Arbello Dr., Psychologist
Elizabeth Alvarez, 1262 La Playa St., Sales
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall St., Computer Consultant
Elizabeth Benford, 508 Andover St., Attorney
Katherine Bubowski, 417 Stockton St., Unemployed
Thomas J. Callan, 175 Sutro Heights Blvd., Consultant
James D. Cantor, 742 Treat Ave., Station Attendant
Henry Conserva, 1284 25th Ave., Professor
Leon Datang, 735 Van Ness Ave., Businessman
Peggy L. Dickson, 320 Montecito, Student
Mark Emery, 555 Taylor St., Artist
James Michael Faye, 1369-B Page St., Tenant Advocate
Philemona Higgs, 146 Fillmore St., Videographer
Ken Johnson, 42 Kellogg St., Cab Driver
Vincent B. Latimer, 4118-A 24th St., Service Manager
Richmond Loewinsohn, 1341 Valencia St., Writer
John B. Loretto, 905 Columbus Ave., Cab Driver/Fisherman
Bernice Martin, 50th Church St., Public Stenographer
Jonathan McCready, 82 Alvandale St., Attorney
Victor E. Miller, 1341 Valencia St., Editor
Steven A. Schaeft, 1301 20th St., Attorney
William F. Taylor, 1890 Chry St., Operating Engineer
Frank S. Warner, 2520 Fillmore St., Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 299 Cotter St., Legal Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JULIANNE MALVEAUX

My address is 26 Winfield Street
My occupation is Economics Professor/Labor Specialist/Writer
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: Native San Francisco and former White House staffer (1977–78) Dr. Julianne Malveaux (pronounced “Mal-Voh”) is an elected California State Central Committee woman who is committed to a diverse San Francisco:
- San Francisco Tomorrow Board Member
- Booker T. Washington/Ella Hill Hutch Board Member
- Strong Supporter: Mondale-Ferraro
- Steering Committee, San Francisco Plan Initiative
- Delegate candidate for Jesse Jackson
- Former staff, President’s Council of Economic Advisors
- Ph.D. (Economics, MIT)
- Co-author of three books
- Columnist, San Francisco Sun Reporter
- Priority focus: job creation programs for youth, minorities, and women
- Author, 1984 Ballot Proposition J which prohibits San Francisco pension fund investments in South Africa.

The sponsors for Julianne Malveaux are:
- Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
- Ricky Bell, 2701 Folsom St., Student
- Judith Breckx, 609 Kansas St., Lawyer, City Commissioner
- Randall Bronner, 1390 Market St., Artist/Musician
- Rene Cazenave, 2523-22nd St., Housing Advocate
- Florence Faulkner, 25 22nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
- Thomas C. Fleming, 2171 O’Farrell St., Journalist
- Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
- Margaret A. Gunn, 3649-18th St., Attorney
- Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
- Yvonne S. Golden, 1743-9th Ave., School Administrator
- Peter M. Good, 709 Shafter St., Arborist
- Roberto Y. Hernandez, 852 Moultrie St., Director, Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
- Geraldine M. Johnson, 852 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer
- Doris W. Kahn, 3259 Clay St., Transportation Commissioner
- Tony Kilooy, 473-11th Ave., President, San Francisco Tomorrow
- Michael Koblenz, 825 Masonic Ave., Distributor
- Otelia Langston, 53 Friendship Way, Senior and Geriatric Specialist
- Arthur Latham, 2350-48th Ave., Personnel Administrator
- Michael C. Miller, 1920 Quint St., Attorney
- Jack D. Morrison, 44 Woodland Ave., Management consultant
- Carl Diole Rees, 2034-46th Ave., Graduate Student
- Ruth Gordon Schnapp, 726-23rd Ave., Structural Engineer
- Frances M. Shaskan, 259-39th Ave., Consumer Rights Advocate
- Anita Silvers, 15 21st St., Professor, S.F. State
- Arlo Smith, 66 Fernandino Way, District Attorney
- Bruce M. St Cyr, 343 Chester Ave., Vice President AFSCME
- Local 2620
- Ida V. Strickland, 1664 Fulton St., Administrator
- Calvin Welch, 419 Ashbury St., Community Consultant

JANET MOLINARI

My address is 30 16th Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: To make San Francisco work takes both good ideas and cooperation with everyone.
- For over 12 years as your Supervisor, my contribution has been to bring together both the diverse viewpoints of San Francisco’s many communities and the other Supervisors to solve our City’s problems. With your support, I’ve:
- Promoted the construction of more housing; limited condominium conversions to protect renters; protected tenants from rent gougers and outrageous security deposits;
- Initiated escort services to protect seniors;
- Initiated preferential parking and parking ticket amnesty programs;
- Protected our neighborhood character from big companies forcing out small merchants; and
- Protected San Francisco’s parks and playgrounds.

The sponsors for John L. Molinari are:
- Dianne Feinstein, 2645 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
- George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
- Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
- Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
- Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
- John Francis Foran, 900 Rockdale Dr., State Senator
- Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
- Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
- Nancy G. Walker, 335 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
- Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
- Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
- Louise K. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Homemaker/Media Producer
- Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
- H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Member, Public Utilities Commission
- Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Pastor
- LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
- Eloise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director, Patient Advocacy
- Gordon J. Lau, 540 19th Ave., Member, Port Commission
- Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California
- Alan S. Wong, 1200 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
- Duke J. Armstrong, 352 Divisadero St., Former President, C.R.I.R.
- Paul Boneberg, 647-A Castro St., President, Stonewall Gay Political Club
- Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, Community United Against Violence
- Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter (B.A.R.)
- Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Member, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Political Club
- Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington Way, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Political Club
- Maureen J. Conroy, 650 Eucalyptus Dr., Homemaker
- John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Chair, Sierra Club Bay Chapter
- Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus
- Michael S. Salarino, 93 Crestlake Dr., Sunset District Merchant

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PAT NORMAN
My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Senior Health Care Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I am a political progressive with extensive professional experience as an administrator, program consultant, mediator, and service provider. These skills and my perspective will be valuable additions to the Board.

My commitment to economic and social justice is backed by 25 years of community service to ethnic and cultural minorities, women, low- and moderate-income families, elders, youths, gay people, small businesses, workers, the disabled, and government policy-makers.

I support neighborhood preservation, affordable housing measures (including rent control), jobs and job training for San Franciscans, comparable worth, and environmental safeguards.

I am a parent and San Francisco homeowner.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:
Priscilla Alexander, 745 Haight St., Feminist Activist
Zohn F. Artman, 141 Albion St., Media Consultant
Michael Bernstein, 378 Goldengate Ave., Executive Director, SF Renaissance
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing Manager
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, CUNA
Dennis M. Collins, 145-27th St., Political Consultant
Greg Day, 2260 Market St., Youth Services Director
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Attorney/Teacher
Walter R. Ems, 188 Bureka St., Retired
Lawrence V. Eppenette, 765 Geneva Ave., Confidential Secretary
Roma Guy, 583 Missouri St., Co-Director, The Women's Foundation
Kenneth W. Jones, 600 Fillmore St., Office Manager; SF AIDS Foundation
Linda Jupiter, 2768-22nd St., Book Production Manager
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Senior Services Administration
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Jane McKensie Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant, S.F. Sheriff's Department
Juanita Owens, 371 Coloridge St., Educator/Administrator
Tish A. Pearlman, 464 Duboce Ave., Writer/Photographer
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Political Activist
Sil Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Union Business Representative
Marguerite Rubenstein, 46 Stillings Ave., Therapist
Stephen H. Walters, 1223 Diamond St., Fundraiser

JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS
My address is 1203 Clayton Street
My occupation is Executive (Probate Attorney)
My qualifications for office are: This is not New York.
My grandfather worked for this city for thirty-six years; helping to make San Francisco the greatest place on earth in which to live. Now our city bus system has to go hat in hand to Los Angeles to borrow buses. The quality of care at our general hospital has come under extreme question. The city of love, tolerance, and understanding is becoming more and more divided by every hate on earth. I, as a fourth generation San Franciscan, call upon you to join us natives in the fight to keep San Francisco San Francisco.

Joseph James Phillips

The Sponsors for Joseph J. Phillips are:
Margaret Moskovitz Berzin, 2201 Lake St., Retired
Ernest Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
Amelia Sheehan, 436-27th Ave., Homemaker
Salvador Garza, 793 Brunswick St., Businessman
Gerald E. Gallagher, 2282-34th Ave., Retired
Jean M. McDermott, 325-9th Ave., Tax Preparer
A. John Shinnon, 39 Mckiefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Juanita G Cardinelli, 1215-18th St., Retired
Peter G. Economou, 2040 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Laura Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Volunteer for Handicapped
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Consuelo G. MacDonald, 801-44th Ave., Retired
Roger Bussetti, 20 Carnelian St., Television Producer
Jody S. Hirota, 571-19th Ave., Dental Hygienist
Maurice C. Bihan, 111 Willard North St., Salesman
Kelly Lyon, 435-25th Ave., Secretary
Rick A. Barsi, 1236 Athens St., Retired Teamster
Laura B. Campbell, 1275-32nd Ave., NOW
William E. Beyer, Jr., 3322 Geary Blvd, Printer
Pearle Wong, 1555 Shadrer St., Housewife
Sophia E. Conley, 2845 Cabrillo St., Teacher
Jimmy Starr, 23 Boardman Pl., Lawyer
Hannah Berzin, 3831-19th Ave., Retired
John L. Santiago, 150 Woodland Ave., Retired
Walter J. Murphy, 767 Corbett Ave., Retired
Carl H. Hoppe, 101 Hamilton St., Retired
Jack I Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
Sam Kelsteine, 84 Lopez Ave., Self Employed
Helen Marie Sheehan, 875-38th Ave., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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LOUISE RENNE

My address is 3725 Jackson Street
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: As Finance Committee chairperson I have protected vital services while cutting wasteful expenditures. Sound policies have been implemented. San Francisco is on solid financial footing.
At the same time I played a leadership role in legislation affecting the environment, health care; Muni, the arts, indeed all San Franciscans (including our seniors and children).
My prior experience includes Deputy Attorney General, Criminal and Environmental Units; argued cases in Supreme Court; President, California Women Lawyers.
As an effective Supervisor, I pledge to continue my hard work, to act responsibly and compassionately, and to speak honestly on the critical issues affecting all San Franciscans.

Louise Renne

The sponsors for Louise Renne are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman 16th District
Bernard Averbush, 59 Rivoli St., Public Relations
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director—CYO—Urban Development
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Pres. Airport Commission
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrer St., Planning Commissioner
Harry G. Britt, 783A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 11 Lunado Way, Minister
Sala Burton, 8 Sloan Blvd., Member of Congress
Thomas J. Cahill, 246-17th Ave., Chief of Police, Retired
Lily Cuno, 3819 Jackson St., Housewife
Dianne Feinstein, 2020 Lyon St., Mayor
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President, Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Vice President, ILGWU
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman/Commissioner
John S. Jennings, 2743 Sun Bruno Ave., Realtor (Ret.)
LeRoy King, 75 Tampa Lane, Regional Director of ILWU
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
Leslie M. Lawrence, 2423 Broadway, Certified Public Accountant
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner and Attorney
Melvin D. Lee, 450-22nd Ave., Engineer (Commissioner, S.F. Redevelopment Agency)
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Cyril Maggin, One Nob Hill Cir., Philanthropist
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor, State of California
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Business Representative
Thomas C. Stanton, 631 Vicente St., Investment Advisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CAROL RUTH SILVER

My address is 68 Ramona Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: Experience: Seven years a San Francisco Supervisor; twenty years a practicing attorney; mother of two.
—Responsiveness to neighborhoods:
My parking reform legislation will open up neighborhood parking spaces.
—Fire and smoke detector legislation will make our whole City more safe.
—Advocate for fairness legislation:
—Preserving sunlight in parks
—Outlawing gay discrimination
—Creating low and moderate income housing
—Repairing City streets and buildings
—Rent control
—Protecting Chinatown merchants
—S.A.F.E. and Senior Escort Programs
—Neighborhood Arts Programs
—Reducing smog
—Preserving San Francisco Bay
—Expanding Muni
—Wheelchair accessibility
—More women and minorities receiving City contracts
—Child care
I will continue to insist on fairness.

The Sponsors for Carol Ruth Silver are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Cyril Maggin, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist
Sala Burton, 8 Sloan Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Jeff Brown, 450-80th Ave., Public Defender
George Agnoe, 2311 Funson Ave., City Attorney
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., San Francisco Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., San Francisco Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, 335 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis St., San Francisco Supervisor
Ben Tem, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, President, Airport Commissioner
H. Welton Fyson, 76 Venus St., Public Utilities Commissioner
Emmett D. Condon, 2506-21st Ave.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Tim M. Daynot, 645 Randolph St., Charity Media Specialist
Teressa E. Griffin, 839-41st Ave., Retired Teacher
Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired
Samuel Jordan, 4066-3rd St., Caterer
Tony Kilroy, 475-11th Ave., Civil Engineer
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Education
Ephraim Margolin, 68 Seeley Way, Attorney
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Realtor
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Business Representative
Jack Trujillo, 74 Ramona St., Word Processor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
DAVID C. SMITH

My address is 2567 Alemany Blvd
My occupation is Administrator, Service Agency
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: I am a San Francisco State graduate in journalism, married, with a deep affection for this place. For seven years my wife and I have counseled families and individuals from every neighborhood in San Francisco—an investment and commitment to the future. Dealing with these problems has increased my awareness of this city’s growing preoccupation with rights and shrinking concern for responsibilities. The solution includes a return to basics, to strong family units, to solid values, to the worth of all human life. I will be a voice for those who feel excluded, especially exploited children and the disadvantaged.

David C. Smith

KEVIN STARR

My address is 445 Chestnut Street
My occupation is Businessman, Communicator, Professor
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Born in San Francisco, I relish the past, present and future of this great city. I know it from a variety of perspectives—as executive aide to Mayor Alioto, as City Librarian, as a newspaper columnist, as a professor, as a businessman, and as a person active in many civic causes. I now wish to bring my talents and experience to the Board of Supervisors. I believe I can be of unique service as the centrist advocate of this city as it looks to its future. That future, the well-being of each of us, will be my greatest concern.

Kevin Starr

The sponsors for David C. Smith are:

James Bailey, Sr., 422 Guerrero St., Minister
Lillian P. Bailey, 422 Guerrero St., Housewife
Janis Ann Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Secretary
Jeffrey Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Photographer
Robert R. Carlson, 337 Baden St., Radio Producer
Victoria A. Carlyle, 1830 Octavia St., Political Analyst
John William Castro, 5 Plymouth St., Mover
John Frederick Decker, 1090 Eddy St., Designer
Frances Edwards, 2554 Alemany Blvd., Housewife
Daisy Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., Homemaker
David Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., High School President
James W. Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Police Officer
Jean Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Housewife
James L. Higgins, 270 Juanita Way, Pastor
Margaret M. Lee, 730-12th Ave., Secretary
Mark W. Lee, 881 Silver Ave., President, Simpson College
Arvid Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Norma Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Secretary
Philip Litton, 3340 San Bruno Ave., Student
John A. McGeehan, 1230 LaPlaya St., Military, U.S. Army
Charles A. McIlhenny, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
J. Thad McKinney, 766 Kansas St., Station Manager
Marilyn G. Miller, 518 Dewey Blvd., Secretary
Chris Montgomery, 518 Dewey Blvd., Church Worker
Lawrence W. Pong, 254 Arch St., Environmental Health Inspector
James Douglas Robinson, 1319-7th Ave., Moving Company Manager
James W. Robinson, 518 Dewey Blvd., Executive Director of a Christian Service Organization
Conrad R. Sanchez, 1808 Octavia St., Restaurant
Constance B. Steinbach, 180 Lippard Ave., Homemaker

The sponsors for Kevin Starr are:

Richard B. Allen, 2111 Franklin St., Merchant
Lynn A. Altshuler, 1490 Sacramento St., Attorney
Thomas E. Anderson, 236 Moncada Way, Clergyman
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Job Training Director
Gino Biradelli, 700 Columbus Ave., Restaurateur
Sam Camhi, 265 San Anselmo Ave., Insurance Estate Planner
Frank J. Caudle, 1034 Chestnut St., Venture Capital Investor
Vyolet L. Chu, 1282 Vallejo St., Asian Art Commissioner
Elizabeth A. Cooley, 2820 Scott St., Legal Assistant
Paul Denning, 2165 California St., Investment Banker
Martin Eng, 665 Pine St., County Central Committee Member
James W. Haas, 163 Prospect Ave., Attorney
Patrick E. Hallinan, 117-27th Ave., Attorney
Barbara E. Hoadley, 999 Green St., Economist
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Allan S. Johnson, 165 Prospect Ave., Consultant
Dorwin Duck Jones, 225 Northpoint St., Gerontologist; Director, Meals on Wheels
Harold K. Lipset, 2509 Pacific Ave., Private Investigator
Frances A. Lopez, 1474 Sacramento St., Paralegal
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Editor
John Maher, 795-8th Ave., Executive
Roxanne Mankin, 212 Pacific Ave., Investment Real Estate
Michael Marston, 3375 Jackson St., Real Estate and Development Consultant
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave., Asst. Business Manager, Local #38
John N. Rosekrans, Jr, 2840 Broadway , Businessman, Toy Manufacturer
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Businessman
Michael Strunksky, 2266 Bay St., Construction Executive
Brooks Walker, Jr., 2930 Broadway, Business Executive
Suzan Yee, 636-6th Ave., Attorney
Candidates for Supervisor

JOHN E. WAHL
My address is 118C Connecticut Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have a 20 year record of voluntary, unpaid public service to San Francisco. I have worked with all levels of City government, with people in all parts of the City. Examples of my public service include being a Judge Pro Tem of the San Francisco Municipal Court, 9 years of service on the Board of the San Francisco Council of Churches, service on the Pride Foundation Board, and service to veterans.
I am dedicated to ensuring affordable places to live, a responsible and unprejudiced police department, decent jobs, and dependable transportation.
I am independent of special interest club politics.

The sponsors for John F. Wahl are:
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, Community College Board
Caroline W. Marks, 55 Jordan Ave., Economist and Civic Leader
James E. Sandmire, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
E. Patricia (Pat) Lucey, 69 Huntington Dr., Attorney
Benjamin L. Marcus, 84 Winfield St., Rabbi and Chaplain
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Walter W. Grumm, 3126-22nd St., Clergyperson
Ann Marie Day, 136 Delmar St., Retired Social Worker
Clive Jones, 3963-18th St., Legislative Aide
Paul S. Yein, 342-8th Ave., Real Estate Agent
Hank Wilson, 1621 Market St., Hotel Operator
Fred L. Kurlander, 115 San Aleso, Attorney
Jean Wall Burgess, 421 Moraga Ave., Lawyer
Gary E. Myerscough, 156 Sproule Ln., Education Administrator
Paula F. Lichtenberg, 925 Jones St., Paralegal
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author, Retired Publisher
Jerry G. Guerra, 85 Fortuna St., Retailer
Clive B. Vaughan, Jr., M.D. 2170 Hayes St., Physician
Ponter W. Weeks, 1910 Greenwich St., Advertising Consultant
Shirley Kaiser, 806-33rd Ave., Teacher
Robert W. Shore, 146 Guerrero St., Businessman
Rosa M. Kwong, 512 Van Ness Ave., Law Student
Charlene Yamato, 416 Font Blvd., Secretary
Jeanette Sibley, 75 Woodhaven Ct., Classroom Teacher
Alan Thompson Smith, 190 Palo Alto Ave., Small Business Owner
William Earl Andrews, 4130 Army St., Taxi Driver
Larry E. Hughes, 87 Fortuna St., Paralegal/Consultant
Julita V. DeChavez, 1591-45th Ave., Deputy County Clerk

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN
My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is Staff-writer for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 58
My qualifications for office are: My program:
Courts, cops and strikebreaking injunctions; two-gate, two-tiered, union-busting tactics, are helping employers depress living standards. Escalating health, housing and food costs are forcing working people—especially Blacks and Latinos—out of San Francisco. Corporate condos and highrises replace workers’ residences.
Door-key children of working parents, denied child-care, are left to roam the streets. Abortion clinics are under siege.
Only united labor—employed, unemployed, black, white—can change this condition. An independent labor party, based on the unions, must be built to replace the callous politicians of the two ruling capitalist parties.
Jobs not war!

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:
Alan A Benjamin, 2783-20th St., Editor, Socialist Action
Paul Colvin, 558-36th Ave., Printer
Nancy G. Eman, 617 Central Ave., Teacher
Ralph P. Forsyth, 77 Cedro St., Teacher
May May Gong, 25 Bessie St., Power Plant Operator
Nancy L. Gruber, 921 Alvarado St., Editor
Millie B. Gonzalez, 2543-32nd Ave., Student
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Longshoreman
Ruth Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Office Worker
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297-18th St., Retail Clerk
William G. Leuner, 535 Day St., Mechanic
Ann Menasche, 2149-48th Ave., Feminist Attorney
Linda I. Ray, 3740-25th St., Registered Nurse
Ann A. Robertson, 535 Day St., Professor
Joseph M. Ryan, 25 Bessie St., Machinist
Karen A. Schieve, 3575-19th St., Sales Clerk
Michael William Schreiber, 3593 Mission St., Muni Driver
Carole Seligman, 245 Whitney St., Muni Bus Driver
Kathryn Setian, 1364-16th Ave., Engineer
Margery Jean VanDerslice, 1540-20th St., Registered Nurse
Christine Vaughn, 1255 Polk St., Foster or Clerk
David Walters, 2543-32nd Ave., Power Plant Operator
Bonnie Weinstein, 1716 Reve Ave., Student
Deborah Weinstein, 1630 Church St., Unemployed Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 489-27th St., Painter

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

DAVE WHARTON

My address is 5031 Diamond Heights Blvd.
My occupation is Community Service Attorney
My age is 44


It's time for housing expansion, for transit, traffic, parking overhaul. Time for better City services, especially for seniors and youth. Time to strengthen economy, create jobs, control taxes. Time for neighborhood revitalization, parking relief. Time for human rights advancement, efficient and humane police services. Experiment with Board meetings in neighborhoods.

It's time for goals, results, citizen participation. San Francisco is world class city, small town; lose either, be neither. I build bridges, not barriers. Join our common sense coalition.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:

Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Libby Denehem, 200 St Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Attorney/Rent Board Commissioner
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Russell Flynn, 2815 Pacific Ave., Real Estate/Rent Board Commissioner
Charles B. Renfrew, 791-14th Ave., Attorney.Former Federal Judge
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Hotel/Real Estate Executive
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Alicia Wang, 1418 Leavenworth St., Educational Specialist
Mortimer Fleishhacker, 13 Bridgeview Plaza, Investor
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
Diane C. Kefauver, 7276 Great Highway, Consultant
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Union President Retired
Jose Gomez, 59 Grandview Ave., Legal Services/Executive Director
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
John L. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Insurance/Savings and Loan Chairman
Phyllis Kern, 306 Arbor St., Labor Union Secretary
Russell I. Kassman, 2454 Bush St., Businessman
Laura E. McBride, 925 Cole St., Typographer
George M. Raya, 90 Verna Ct., City Employee
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Development Executive
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Agent
Lawrence A. Wilson, 333-A Pierce St., Attorney—Community Volunteer
Deborah R. Pines, 4248-20th St., Financial Consultant
John T. McAlister, Jr, 999 Green St., Businessman
Bobbie Griffith, 50 Leland Ave., District Attorney Investigator
Edith Wellin, 165-A Alpine Ter., Teacher

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

DICK CERBATOS

My address is 471 Hoffman Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have always been deeply interested in the education of youth. Before my appointment to the Board of Education two years ago, I served twenty years on Citizens' Advisory and PTA committees focusing on education. As an engineer business-owner, I also bring professional skills to the Board.

As a first generation American, I am sympathetic to minority children's problems, and aware that public education is the golden gateway to opportunity and success.

I intend to continue pressing for higher test scores, improved discipline and morale, less truancy, and an increase in college admissions.

I am committed to excellence in education.

A. Richard Cerbatos

The sponsors for Dick Cerbatos are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Lawyer
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Inventor
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney at Law
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director
Judith Dellamonica, 3323 Taraval St., President, San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President-Personnel
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Eugene S. Hopp, 801 Van Ness Ave., Physician
Thomas, E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Ralph F. Hurtado, 65 Newburg St., Executive Director
Matile J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Labor-Vice President, ILGWU

Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir. ILGWU
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Bette Wallace Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Cir., Homemaker
Wendy Nelder, 150 Castitas Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565-40th Ave., U.C. Regent
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, S.F. Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON

My address is 29 Oliver Street
My occupation is Transit Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I was born and raised in San Francisco, graduating from Balboa High.

For the past 7 years I have been active in the school district having been elected to 2 terms on the District Advisory Committee, 4 years as the chairperson of the Pelton Academic Middle School Parent's Group, and 5 years on the site advisory council at Pelton.

I am married and have 2 children attending Commodore Sloat Elementary School.

I believe there is much work needed to provide the quality education our children need to prepare them for a highly technical society of computers and robotics.

Chris Christenson

The sponsors for Christopher Christenson are:
Essie L. Webb, 186 Maddux Ave., Intake & Referral Specialist
Raymond Tunstall, 515 John Muir Dr., Deputy Sheriff
Francis Smyth, 1709-16th Ave., Deputy Sheriff
Harry E. Jensen, III, 74 Delmonte St., Electrical Transit Manager
Joe W. Turner, 1274 Palou Ave., Janitor Supervisor II
Martin Larkin, 4733 Lincoln Way, Paint Supervisor
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Supervisor II
Joseph Dela Ross, 50 Oliver St., Seaman
Precious Moore, 2046 Thomas Ave., Home Health Aide
Liana Sand Dune Kastina, 524 Clipper St., Clerk Typist
William Satchell, 500 Francisco St., Transit Car Cleaner
Roy W. Haver, 576 Lisbon St., Marble Shopman
Guadalupe Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Jeanne L. Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Grocery Clerk
Roosevelt Lancaster, 170 Ledyard St., Transit Car Cleaner
Lena M. Quintana, 3351 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Alfred Lent, 1475 Church St., Electrical Mechanic
George Williams, Sr., 335 Hearst Ave., Retired
Beatrice L. Dunbar, 430 Thornton Ave., Retired
Vicente Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Driver
Gabriela, R. Wilkerson, 1547-15th Ave., Cashier

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

LIBBY DENEBEIM
My address is 200 St. Francis Blvd.
My occupation is Incumbent School Board Member
My qualifications for office are: Four years ago you elected me to the school board. I am deeply grateful.
I have worked hard. Student achievement scores improved, enrollment stabilized. We strengthened significantly special programs and alternative schools.
There remains much work to do. As a mother of six public school educated children, former teacher and experienced school board member, I know how our schools should work.
Many children today will finish school in the 21st Century. For all our children we must plan for the future, reaffirm our commitment to excellence, use school dollars prudently and ensure the momentum for improvement in our schools continues.

Libby Denebeim

The sponsors for Libby Denebeim are:
Robert S. Denebeim, 200 St Francis Blvd., Businessman
Art Aono, 857 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Brit, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
William K. Coble, 10th Ave., Attorney
Patricia F. Costello, 2858 Green St., Community Leader
Carolee T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2050 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Zuretti L. Goody, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA Volunteer
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Thomas Hsih, 4 Cortez St., Police Commissioner
Cynthia Brown Kelly, 460 Magellan St., Homemaker
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., Board of Education Member
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Leo T. McCarthy, 450 Magellan St., Lt. Governor
Peter Mezey, 3552 Clay St., Attorney/Businessman
Carole Migen, 501-28th St., Mental Health Director
John L. Molinaro, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
Philip Bruce Ratul, 962 Clayton St., SF Open/Space Committee
Member
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor/Cay Lederer
Joan-Marie Shelley, 856 Burnett Ave., Teacher/President, SF Federation of Teachers
Arthur Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-1st Ave., Regent, University of California
Pansy Zonnie Waller, 649 San Jose Ave., Contract Compliance Representative
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Malcolm S.M. Watts, 270 Seacliff Ave., Physician

GEORGE DYKSTRA
My address is 949 Filbert Street
My occupation is Community Services Director
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am trained in government finance and Citizen Participation decision making. Long community involvement includes director, Educational Services, Executive Board of Golden Gate Child Development, Saint Mary's Hospital Board and Yick Wo Elementary Parent's Committee. My education includes a B.A., emphasizing Education and U.C.S. graduate school.
I am practical, experienced and positive. I expect more from students, parents and teachers. I promise fiscal responsibility. I respect and support parent participation, teacher professionalism and every student's right to learn in well-equipped, orderly schools. Opportunity, Technology and Basics.
Vote for me! I will keep children in the picture.

George Dykstra

The sponsors for George Dykstra are:
Ilsa Bardaro, M.D., 880 Sloat Blvd., Physician
Milliecent E. Buxton, 80 Parnassus Ave., Educator
Robert T. Corrado, 18 Miramar Ave., Administrator
Teresa M. D'Aurny, 75 Heath St., Environmental Fund Raising
Kathleen DePaoli, 949 Filbert St., Psychologist
Kathleen Dykstra, 949 Filbert St., Legal Administrator
Linda J. Gaudreau, 875-2st Ave., Director of Medical Records
Teresa Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Attorney-at-Law
Ann K. Howell-Ions, 904 Cortland Ave., Volunteer Coordinator
D. S. Inaba, 44 Escondido Ave., Associate Professor
Martha Anne Jesup, 2562 Diamond St., Educator
Deborah L. Keller, 1466-41 Ave., Student
Katherine Lambert, 63 Winfield St., Women's Services Consultant
Mim Landry, 1508 Cole St., Student
Nick Lederer, 79 Miraph St., Executive Director, Senior Services
Dr. Thomas S. McCoy, 1446 Clay St., Professor
Tim P. Mues, M.D., L.A. Landy's L'l., AIDS Clinician-Researcher
Susan L. Mok, 132-38th Ave., Acupuncturist
Marcia Quackenbush, 1690-27th Ave., Social Worker
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 935 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director
CAREED
Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Director of Health
Kanineth M. Sins, 1454 Palou Ave., Associate Director Child Development Center
David E. Smith, 80 Parnassus Ave., Physican
Hserrat E. Smith, 345 Montocello St., Attorney
Michael Stephenian, 2109 Baker St., Attorney
Harvey W. Q. Tse, 70 Lomita Ave., Businessman
Nancy Q. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas, Methodist Minister
E. Leif Zerkin, 732-20th Ave., Editor

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

My address is 665 Pine Street
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant

My qualifications for office are: Twelve years of community and civic service.

Issues
Eng supports:
• Our children’s inherent right for education.
• Regain respect for our teachers.
• Strict measures to halt school violence. Stop the sale and use of street drugs.
• Higher standards for teachers and students.
• Encourage teachers and parents participation within the Board.
• Merit pay to outstanding teachers.
Maximize income: Lease surplus school properties. End mismanagement by incompetent Board members. Eng opposes:
• Current programs teaching alternative lifestyle to our precious children. A violation of the First Amendment.
• Board members extravagant dinner meetings with liquor paid for by taxpayers. A blatant violation of the law.

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:
John Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Real Estate Broker, Former Supervisor
John Rickett, 4426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Commissioner, Contractors State License Board, State of California
Lee S. Dobson, 1755 Beach St., Professor, Former Supervisor
Dr. John B. Tsu, 2 Denslow Dr., Education Commissioner
Melvin M. Bell, 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Landmark Preservation Board
Steven J. Doh, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
C. Mackey E. Salazar, 183 San Benito Way, City Planning Commissioner
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli St., Retired
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, State Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Anna Kyle Pauwewang, 30 Cunningham Pl., Legal Assistant
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th St., Vice President, District One Political Action
Kevin G. Moliari, 2247-26th Ave., Property Consultant
John S. Tang, M.D. 2184 Funston Ave., Physician
Timothy A. Tosta, 870 Ashbury St., Attorney
Jung Roy Gee, 665 Pine St., Investor, Education Researcher
William Bernstein, 1000 Franklin St., Attorney
Robert F. Varini, 10 Miller Pl., Chariman-Poole Data Systems
Frank S. Yee, 358 Los Palmos Dr., Real Estate Finance; Teacher
Rev. Charles A. McIlhenny, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
William Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney at Law
F. Theodore Kitt, 2801 Broadway, Lawyer
Robbin Tom, 28 Anapolis Ter., V.P.-Branch Manager, S & L
Veina Petersesse, 665 Pine St., Teacher
Ed Pond, 16-58th Ave., Insurance broker/Accountant
S.M. Saroyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Business Enterprise/Lawyer
Frank N. Alito, 2898 Valheiro St., Restaurant Owner
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., 444 Coit Ave., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Assn.

EUGENE S. HOPP, M.D.

My address is 601 Van Ness Avenue, Opera Plaza
My occupation is Physician

My qualifications for office are: For the past thirteen years I have served on the Board of Education as an independent voice committed to the goal of educating all our children to their fullest potential. The current stress on teaching the basics must continue, combined with offerings of high technology and vocational courses designed to prepare our diverse student population for a changing future. I stand for an integrated educational program and welcome parents and the public to assist me in this challenge.

Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Eugene S. Hopp are:
Molly M. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Telecommunications Executive
Dianne Feinstein, 3020 Lyon St., Mayor
Joseph L. Allott, 2510 Pacific Ave., Attorney
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Supervisor
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sedonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, Vice President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr, 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission
Burt A. Tolles, 581 Orizaba Ave., Police Commissioner
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Police Commissioner
Alan S. Wong 1280 Ellis St., Commissioner, Community College
Julie Tang, 788-16th Ave., Board Member S F Community College
John F. Crowley, 87 Los Palmos Dr., Labor Official
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Amos J. Castro, 1401 California St., Physician
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Civil Rights Administrator
Harry Pollan, 637 Powell St., Economist
Saul Madles, 75 Country Club Dr., Retired, School Admin.
Jo Birnam, 1720 Taylor St., Housewife
Anita H. Sanchez, 44 Restani Way, Social Worker
Chadwick C. Ertola, 660 Greenwich St., Attoney
Naomi Gray, 1291 Stanford St., Businesswoman
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
Raye G. Richardson, 1714 Fillmore St., Assoc. Professor
Max L. Christensen, 2 Heath Ave., Clergyman
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave, Asst Business Mgr.
Leo J. Murphy, Sr., 61 Anapolias Ter., Real Estate Broker
Lane E. De Lara, 2 Lenox Way, Educational Consultant
Gregory C. Lintner, 2600 Webster St., Realtor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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TERRY HUGUNIN
My address is 1824 Noriega Street
My occupation is Consultant
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: Those of us who were teenagers during President Kennedy's Appolo Space Program thought there was nothing we and our nation might not accomplish: "We're going to the moon in ten years!" Thanks to outfits like the National Education Association, the science oriented New Frontiers of the 60's have given way to the "other-directedness" of the Aquarian Age. Their goal: form a society of androgynous pacifists—study their literature. Mine is to restore the problem-solving orientation appropriate to Judeo-Christian culture. Help me mobilize our schools to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative and overcome the nuclear war threat.

Terry Hugunin

The sponsors for Terry Hugunin are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Fallonlones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
Chester Miller, 52 Ralph St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Stanicek, 236-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozitis, 1530 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

JAMES LEGARE
My address is 254 Oak Street
My occupation is Motor Truck Operator
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I am committed to installing a sound educational program in our schools as the basis for getting our country and economy moving again— in the American tradition. We need to develop young minds through a program of classical education and to protect them by wiping out drugs in the schools and in the nation.

I propose to reform the school system along these lines:
1) Classical geometry and physics, as typified by Plato, Archimedes, Cusa Kepler, and Leibniz
2) Classical poetry, music, and drama, exemplified by Homer, Aeschylus, Dante, Shakespeare, Schiller, Bach, and Beethoven

James Legare

The sponsors for James Legare are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Fallonlones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
Chester Miller, 52 Ralph St., Foster Mother
Nick Pace, 130 Campbell Ave., Railroad Employee
Sandra Parks, 16 Garces St., Railroad Employee
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Stanicek, 236-32nd Ave., Dentist
Nicholas E. Vallejo, 875 Cayuga Ave., Electrician
John Vozitis, 1530 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

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

JO ANNE MILLER

My address is 1920 Quint Street
My occupation is Parent and Teacher

My qualifications for office are: I am the mother of two children in San Francisco Public Schools. I believe in the Public School System, and have a personal interest in its quality and effectiveness. I am a teacher of the blind. I am President of the Glen Park School Site Advisory Committee, and hold other elected civic offices.

The lack of parent representation on the School Board has contributed to a lack of parent and citizen involvement, a lack of long-term planning and vision in school administration, and a failure to commit the School District to a plan and goal of excellence for all children.

JoAnne Miller

BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones Street
My occupation is Transportation Analyst

My qualifications for office are: I believe I have provided outstanding leadership during my eight years on the San Francisco Board of Education. This is evidenced by the fact that test scores have improved and new programs have attracted students back from private schools.

As an active parent, I know San Francisco's schools first-hand. I have worked conscientiously for our children's future. I have the vision and I have gained the practical skills necessary to continue building our school district into one of the best large urban districts in the nation.

Benjamin Tom

The sponsors for JoAnne Miller are:

Julie C. Anderson, 575-59th Ave., Education Specialist
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Michele Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Angel D. Contreras, 1401 Alabama St., Administrator of Headstart

Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Dening St., President, San Francisco NOW
Linda Fries, 830-35th Ave., Community Organizer
Bob Garry, 2578 Great Highway, San Francisco Police Officer
Louise Harvey, 673 Fulton St., Educational Consultant
Marilee Hearn, 3060 Turk Blvd., Teacher
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney Investigator
Darrell Inouye, 251 Gates St., Attorney
Clarence Jones, 3833-Eth St., Legislative Assistant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir., ILWU
Myra G. Kopf, 190-12th Ave., School Board Member
Jean E. Kortum, 80 Mcread Ave., Environmentalist
Ruth Asawa, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Member of Board of Supervisors
Peter Mezey, 3392 Clay St., Business Executive
Hugh B. Miller, 355 Roosevelt Way, Attorney
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
James E. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Taxi Cab Owner
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingersoll Ave., Executive Director, CAHEED, Inc.

Jerry Ringerman, 485 Crestmont Dr., Executive Director, San Francisco Jewish Community Center
Thelma Shelley, 70 Eversen St., Performing Arts Administrator
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., President, AAFUM

The sponsors for Ben Tom are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Supervisor, San Francisco
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commission
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Thomas Hsiung, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director, CYO
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Ben L. Horn, 1 Villa Ter., Banker, Executive
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker, Community College Board Member
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director, Pre-Trial Diversion Project
Willie B. Kennedy, 959 Duncan St., Supervisor, City and County
Sall Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Supervisor
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shafter St., Planning Commissioner
Myra G. Kopf, 390-12th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sofonios S. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Board Member School Administrator
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Business Representative
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Art Agaon, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman, 16th District

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ERNEST "CHUCK" AYALA
My address is 4402-20th Street
My occupation is Youth Director, CYO-Urban Development Division
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan, South of Market neighborhood. Attended public and parochial schools, including City and Lone Mountain Colleges. My involvement in community development and public service is with youth in Education, Employment and Delinquency Prevention, in addition to developing and administrating Senior Citizens and Veterans Programs. Business management background in labor, insurance and real estate provides me with a balanced approach to fiscal and administrative objectives of the Community College District. My continued goal for the Community College District is to retain its open door policy and remain responsive to the educational and vocational needs of the people.

Ernest Chuck Ayala

The sponsors for Ernest “Chuck” Ayala are:
Reginald Y. Alexander, 182 Middlefield Dr., Vice Chancellor, Certified
Bernice E. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Homemaker
Louise F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College District
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, S.F. Community College Board
Vincent J. Callan, 4038 19th St., Retired
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
Tina Burgess Cook, 59 Chabot St., Housewife
Marjorie M Colvin, 1835 Franklin St. #1403, Housewife
Peter J. Faitooh, 30 Grand View Ave., Businessman
William L. Fazio, 110 Inverness Dr., Asst District Attorney
Herman Gallegos, 149 Riple St., Management Consultant
Al Graf, 859 Bryant St., Businessman
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Marcel Kapulica, 2470 22nd Ave., Dental Laboratory-Owner
Louis E. Lagger, 4001 21st St., District Manager, Pucking Co.
Dorothy J. Lubetich, 15 Florentine St., Retired
Ernestine A. McGoldrick, 4442 20th St., School Clerk/Housewife
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., 1789 Eucalyptus St., State Assemblyman
-Licensed
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Susan Ann Roualdes, 340-A Taraval St., Florist
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., President, S.F. Police Commission
Bob (Robert) Schmidt, 4048 21st St., Librarian
Thommat N. Scott, 1912-2 Broderick St., Youth Program Coordinator
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba St., Educator/Police Commissioner
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Bernard J. Ward, 3300 Kirkham St., Atty at law
Bill Zorzakis, 545 Castro St., Shoe Repairer

AMOS CLEOPHILUS BROWN
My address is 111 Lunado Way
My occupation is Clergyman
My age is 43
My qualifications for office are: I hold the B.A., M.Div. and D.D. degrees. 16 years of public service on boards of education throughout the U.S. more than qualifies me for the position.
My services on the Board of Governors since 1982 reflect that I am competent and able to work with a team of governors to ensure the delivery of a quality education system for all persons in our community who desire training for marketable skills. Community College also must serve the needs of those who for various reasons have not had the opportunity of going to other institutions of higher learning for training.

Amos C. Brown

The sponsors for Amos C. Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Member, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, Community College Board
Priscilla A. Demnara, 210 Broad St., Secretary
James Gordon Emerson, Jr., 175 Beaumont St., Clergyman
Mayor Dianne Feinstein, 2080 Lyon St., Mayor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venice St., Public Accountant
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Zelma R. Harrison, 1957 Hayes St., Bookkeeper
Richard D. Houghton, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Grandview A. Jackson, 257 Kensington Way, Retired
Clifton R. Jeffers, 1883 14th Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor
John L. Molinaro, 30 16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Laurelbank Newkirk, 554 Brussels St., System Support Librarian
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Naomi Shines, 756 Page St., Fiscal Clerk
Rabbi Malcolm M. Sparer, 1059 Clement St., Rabbi
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 50 Hilmar St., Minister
Hannah A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergyman
Tomothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, President, College Board
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PATRICK C. FITZGERALD
My address is 128 Detroit Street
My occupation is San Francisco County Central Committeeeman, 16th Assembly District.
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: • Am married, father of three children and a homeowner
• Graduated: St. Ignatius College Prep. and City College of San Francisco
• Elected San Francisco County Central Committeeeman (since 1970)
• California State Central Committeeeman (since 1978)
• Attended San Francisco 1984 National Presidential Convention for Mondale-Ferraro
• Served on San Francisco City Government CATV Task Force Educational Access Committee
• Instrumental in adoption of San Francisco City College Labor Studies Program
• Great Nephew of former San Francisco County Supervisor Tom O’Dowd
• Past Secretary San Francisco County Central Committee
• Strong opponent 1983 Feinstein Recall
• Successfully fought peripheral canal
• Support Propositions: 33 (disabled homeowners) and 40 (political campaign reform).

Patrick C. Fitzgerald

The sponsors for Patrick C. Fitzgerald are:
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official
John J. Moylan, 2585-24th Ave., Labor Leader
Teresa Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Marion L. Faulkner, 20 Taraval St., Social Worker
Patricia K. Mooser, 1762-17th Ave., Tax Consultant/Bookkeeper
Josephine Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Central Committeeeman

DEAN GOODMAN
My address is 825 Geary Street #703
My occupation is Retired Teacher/Actor
My age is 64
My qualifications for office are: Thirty years of teaching, an educator’s concern for quality instruction, and a citizen’s awareness of the need for budget control. As the first fulltime president of the Community College Federation of Teachers, Local 2121 and as a former staff member of the District I know well the policies and procedures which form the structure of the Community College and the College Centers.

If elected, I will insist on fair hiring practices, and as a member of that most diverse of all groups, our Senior Citizens, I will support college services for all adults regardless of individual differences.

Dean Goodman

The sponsors for Dean Goodman are:
Priscilla Alden, 1677 Bush St., #8, Actress
Ugo Baldassari, 988 Dolores St., Theatre Director
James E. Ballard, 2 Arbor St., Teacher
Sheldon I Balman, 5 Perego Ter., Attorney
Lauret R. Broussal, 855 Quintara St., Administrator, Community College
Kimberly Cochran, 1330 Bush St., Bar Owner
Donna Climent, 117 Ord St., Refugee Resettlement Counselor
Lauri Fried-Lee, 435 19th Ave., Community College Instructor
William Gundel, 1415 Franklin St., Credit Adjuster
Frances T. Hughes, 2649 Polk St., Legal Secretary
Donna Ilyin, 76 Wash Ave., Counselor
Lynda Bergen Kalb, 24 Magnolia St., Singer/Actress
Michael J. Mandel, 12 Marine St., Attorney
Donnald J. Miller, 26 Leo St., Furniture Manufacturer
Jay Moran, 1667 Page St., Business Representative
Allan Nomura, 177 Bocana St., Theatrical Photographer
Judy Winn-Bell Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Teacher/Author/Editor
Roger E. W-B Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Publisher
Frank Reilly, 3415 Divisadero St., Advertising/Actor
James J. Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Rev. James E. Sandmire, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
Eve Stoddard, 180 Diamond St., Probate Administration
Daniel A. Sullivan, 1590 Sacramento St., Attorney
Doug Trantham, 701 Taylor St., Fisnast
Sigrid Wurschmidt, 1142 DeHaro St., Actress
Samuel L. Zanze, 2581 25th Ave., Businessman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ANDRE F. PEHARGOU
My address is 3840 Fulton Street
My occupation is Civil Servant
My qualifications for office are: I have been a resident of San Francisco for 34 years. I am a graduate of California State University San Francisco; San Francisco City College, and Lowell High School.

Most taxpayers are not benefitting from the Community College System due to lack of information and lack of convenient locations.

As a Board member, I will advocate a strong academic curriculum; More neighborhood locations to facilitate Senior citizens and working taxpayers; Better utilization of present facilities, and a decrease in tuition fees for City residents.

If you want expanded services to help benefit you, give me your support on election day.

Andre F. Pehargou

The sponsors for Adre F. Pehargou are:
William Angelopoulus., 59 Prague St., Employed
Renee Boulay, 605 Arguello Blvd., Retired
Josephine Bucchiotti, 353 25th Ave., Retired
Andre Carrey, 487 2nd Ave., Retired
James Edward Coleman, 620 Banks St., Supervisor
Alice Crovere, 1827 Balboa St., Part Time Office Worker
Robert S. Flahavan, 151 Buchanan St., Operations Officer, S. F. Airport
Emma Garrigues, 2702 Anza St., Retired
Diana Hantman, 361 25th Ave., Teacher
Rose Hantman, 720 La Playa St., #307, Retired
Paulette Henderson, 798 Naples St., Retired
Paul Keplinger, 3832 Fulton St., Concierge
Anna Konor, 3315 Irving St., Retired
James Courtney Kovac, 1282 43rd Ave., Lithographer
Eva Lim, 3832 Fulton St., Asst. Paymistress
D. Martin, 87 Seward St., Supervisor

JULIE TANG
My address is 788-18th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor's degree in Psychology from the University of San Francisco; Master's in Education from Stanford University; Juris Doctorate from Hastings College of Law; a wife, mother, former teacher and counselor; and presently, Assistant District Attorney in San Francisco.

I have served diligently, always conscious of my responsibility to all the communities of San Francisco who gave me the highest number of votes four years ago. I strive to ensure that the Community College will continue providing quality education to all students, even during financial crises, without sacrificing student or faculty needs. As the only woman board member, I actively support women's issues.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
John Yehall Chinn, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guerrero St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member Board of Supervisors
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Univ of Cali Regent
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Commissioner, Board of Education/School Administrator
Arlo E. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant SF Sheriff's Dept.
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member SF Community College Board
Madeleine H. Russell, 3778 Washington St., Investments
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Agripino R. Cerbitos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Anne Belisle Dalley, 795 Geyers Blvd., Executive Director
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member SF Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Community Activist
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramoni St., Incumbent SF Supervisor
Bette W. Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney's Investigator
Jeffrey K. Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 910 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer/Worker, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

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

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

Moy Velasquez

THE SPONSORS FOR MOY VELASQUEZ ARE:

Lilian Aldea, 231 Granada Ave., Teacher
Concepcion G. Bustot, 49 Capp St., Teacher
Melandro Bustot, 49 Capp St., Student
Victoriano G. Bustot, 49 Capp St., Mechanic
Stasia Cagara, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Sales
Rosita T. Castaneda, 18 Guy Pl., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion P. Cespedes, 931 Prague St., Teacher
Cheryl R. Conrad, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student
Theresa N. Fabro, 4186 Mission St., School Lunchroom Manager
Kenneth A. Guerra, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Technician
Odelia Jones, 1775 Newcomb Ave., Housekeeper
Felisa P. Misenas, 266 Brighton Ave., School Lunch Helper
Basil C. Nickerson, 336-6th St., Self Employed
Willie B. Nicholas, 1231-5th Ave., Custodian
Jack Lee Ponewash, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Production Manager
Margaret M. Powers, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Customer Service
Clarice D. Robinson, 2445 Harrison St., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion A. Ramos, 2700 Folsom St., Room Cleaner
Murdie Washington, 195 Highland St., Monitor
David A. Woodard, 397 Green St., Chef

DR. TIM WOLFRED

My address is 91 Sanchez Street
My occupation is Incumbent, President, San Francisco Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: As an incumbent, I am proud of a College Board that, with less dollars than it had four years ago, has kept all programs operating and has expanded services to San Franciscans most dependent on a healthy community college system for access to job skills training and a basic college education. Neighborhood college centers have moved into larger, renovated facilities. Vocational offerings in fields like computer technologies, nursing, and auto mechanics have been updated. Classes in language skills have been strengthened in immigrant communities. We are a Board dedicated to quality education open to all San Franciscans.

Dr. Tim Wolfred

THE SPONSORS FOR DR. TIM WOLFRED ARE:

Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
Wille Brown, 1200 Gough St., Assembly Member
Art Agnos, 657 Connecticut St., Assembly Member
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff, City and County of San Francisco
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinar, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wille B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Brit, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Alan Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Member, Community College Board
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Sodonia Wilson, 540 Durian Way, School Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., School Board Member
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member
Agripino R. Ceballos, 471 Hoffman Ave., School Board Member
Carlota T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Harold Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist
A. Ceci Williams, 60 Hilmar St., Pastor, Glide Church
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher
Sandy Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Thomas Peretti, 5787-16th St., Banker
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Pointer
Sal Roselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Official
Carole Migden, 563-28th St., Executive Director, Operation Concern

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Port Revenue Bonds

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

YES 253
NO 254

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Port Commission operates the Port of San Francisco. When funds are needed for Port construction or improvements, the Commission may issue revenue bonds to raise funds. A majority of the voters must approve these bonds before they can be issued. The revenue bonds are then paid from Port revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance several improvements of Port property. These improvements include modernizing container handling facilities, upgrading various piers, constructing a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, and renovating certain other Port structures and property. The bonds would then be paid off from Port revenues.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance improvements of Port property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Port Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$42,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>$81,761,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt service requirement</td>
<td>$124,261,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Based on a three year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning four years after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $4,462,000 to a maximum of $5,760,000 annually for twenty-seven years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Port revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Port sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Port. Analysis of projected resources available to the Port indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On July 30 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on a motion placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 51.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The revitalization of the Port of San Francisco will bring new jobs and new tax revenue to the City. A healthy port, with increased ship traffic, will bring millions each year to the San Francisco economy.

By delaying modernizations in the past, the Port of San Francisco lost the bulk of its maritime business to other Bay Area and West Coast cities. The same mistakes must not be made twice. We must allow the Port to use revenues to finance continued improvements.

Proposition A does not authorize any new taxes. Proposition A simply authorizes the Port to use revenues to finance improvements and expansion.

Proposition A will allow for the modernization of existing container cargo terminals on the southern waterfront. These improved facilities will retain current business and will bring new lines to San Francisco. The return of the shipping business will bring back long lost blue-collar jobs to the waterfront as well as white collar jobs.

In addition, Proposition A will provide for expansion of the passenger facility, a new breakwater to protect the commercial fishing fleet, and improved rail access to the port. In all, Proposition A will upgrade and modernize San Francisco Port facilities so as to make them competitive with other ports across the Bay and throughout the West Coast.

The complete modernization effort will be done at no cost to the taxpayers. Instead, the Port of San Francisco's income will be used to finance long-term revenue bonds.

The people of San Francisco deserve a first-rate port. We urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote YES on Proposition A.

As Mayor, I have worked hard to restore our port to its historic pre-eminence as a major gateway to the Far East.

Once again, major shipping lines are docking in San Francisco. Just recently, two of the largest container vessel operators, China Ocean Shipping Corporation and Columbus Lines, signed agreements to use this port.

Not only modern cargo carriers, but passenger liners as well are being drawn to San Francisco in a remarkable renaissance of maritime commerce.

But if there is to be a lasting renewal of our waterfront, the port must be competitive with other port cities anxiously contending for the burgeoning Pacific trade. The port, if it is to prosper, must modernize and enlarge its basic maritime facilities.

That's the purpose of Proposition A.

Proposition A will make the Port of San Francisco truly and vigorously competitive. And it will not cost the taxpayers a penny.

Proposition A will authorize $42.5 million in revenue bonds for vital waterfront projects, including the conversion of Pier 80 into a modern, state-of-the-art container facility and the enlargement and modernization of cargo operations at Piers 94 and 96.

Additionally, Proposition A will provide funds for repairing the now deteriorating Jefferson Street Seawall and will match Federal dollars for construction of a much-needed breakwater to protect the City's fishing fleet at Fisherman's Wharf.

Proposition A also will finance expansion of the passenger terminal at Pier 35.

Proposition A is a prudent investment in the City's future. And these bonds are payable only from port revenues—your taxes will not be increased.

More ships, with more cargo and more passengers, mean more jobs and greater economic vitality for our city.

Proposition A will make our port, once again, a strong and lasting competitor for the commerce of the Pacific Basin. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco needs a good, working port. Vote yes on Proposition A and help bring it about.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Citizens of San Francisco are worried about the deterioration of the port. Most of us can remember when the port was a thriving, bustling commercial enterprise, and the docks were maintained, clean, efficient, and busy.

But, the port has not adapted to container cargo, and may be losing the few shipping lines that it now serves. We must restructure the docks for active container shipping, and bring in railway lines to service the docks.

We have one of the few deep water ports in America, an essential for modern shipping. LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT BEING ONE OF THE BEST PORTS IN THE WEST AGAIN!

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Wendy Nelder
President of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will permit the Port of San Francisco to issue bonds to finance needed construction and improvements. This would give the Port the same financing ability the Airport now has.

Through the issuance of revenue bonds, the Port would be able to undertake necessary improvements AT NO COST TO TAXPAYERS.

San Francisco deserves a modern, thriving port. Proposition A will help us build modern terminals, a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf which will help keep commercial fishermen in San Francisco, repair the seawall at Jefferson Street and expand our Passenger Terminal to handle increased cruise business that brings millions of dollars into our local economy.

Proposition A will give the Port of San Francisco the ability to make these kinds of improvements. Please join me in voting YES.

Sala Burton,
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A offers San Franciscans the opportunity to direct the future of the Port of San Francisco.

This measure will provide our Port with the key to the future.

We must keep pace with new developments, increase cargo and create new jobs. For every fifty new containers we move, 1.67 new jobs will be created.

This measure also includes funding for construction of the Fisherman's Wharf Breakwater, which is critically needed and long overdue.

Take part in the future of our Port. Join with me in voting YES on Proposition A.

Milton Marks,
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a waterfront city. We have a superb natural harbor, which is also one of the few really deep water harbors—vital for modern deep water cargo ships.

We have used our badly deteriorating and long unimproved pier facilities to their maximum efficiency. But ... times are changing. We must move NOW to keep pace with new developments, or risk enormous losses in cargo shipping, commercial fishing, and tourist trade.

It is ESSENTIAL that we adapt to container cargo that can be moved by train, truck, and ship.

Research has been done on what could give us the greatest increase in efficiency and profits for the very least amount of money. And the answer is: modernizing the South Terminal for adaptation to container cargo; providing rail access to the docks; protecting the commercial fishing fleet with a breakwater; and expanding passenger-handling facilities for cruise passenger tourists.

Prop A will provide these improvements RIGHT NOW. And ... AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION
Arthur H. Coleman, President
James Rudden, Vice President
Gordon Lau, Member
Anne Halsted, Member
James Herman, Member

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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Verified as Correct:

Date ____________
Deputy Registrar __________

PRINTED NAME - LETRAS DE IMPRENTA - 正楷書寫姓名

SIGNATURE - FIRMA - 申請人簽名

DATE - FECHA - 日期

RESIDENCE ADDRESS - RESIDENCIA DIRECCION - 住址

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:

Mailing address, if different from above
Dirección Postal (si es diferente)

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter's Initials ____________

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Volante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Volante Ausente Permanente.

Descripción del Impedimento/Incapacidad
Iniciales del Votante ____________

永久缺席選民
本人在此申請永久缺席選民身分。根據選舉法典第
一四五一段的要求，我在下欄說明為
申請成為永久缺席選民身分的原因。

說明障礙情形和性質
選民簽名 ____________
FROM:


DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION?  
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACIÓN?)

| APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN 
| REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M., 
| TUESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1984 
| 7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY. |

申誼缺席選票必須在選挙日七日之前，即十月三十日星期二下午五時經由選民註冊官辦事處收到此申請表格。

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA 
DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO 
DE LA TARDE, MARTES, 30 DE OCTUBRE DE 1984, 
EL SEPTIMO DÍA ANTERIOR AL DÍA DE LA 
ELECCION.

JAY PATTERSON 
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS 
155 CITY HALL 
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Port Revenue Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fisherman's Wharf is a valued segment of the community and needs your help to ensure its economic well-being.

A YES vote on Proposition A will provide the needed financing to build the long awaited breakwater to ensure the safety of our commercial fishing fleet, create new berths and new jobs.

A YES vote on Proposition A will repair the Jefferson Street Seawall before it becomes a dangerous hazard to our visitors and to our community.

A YES vote will insure the economic vitality of Fisherman's Wharf as well as the entire San Francisco Waterfront.

Join with us and vote YES.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Louis Ferrari, President
Crab Boat Owner's Association

Christopher Martin
President, Fisherman's Wharf Merchant Assoc.

Fritz Arko
Alessandro Baccari
Ex. Secretary, Fisherman's Wharf Merchant Assoc.

L. B. Barnes
Fisherman's Wharf Seafood

Phil Benitevenga
Fishing Boat Butchie B

Bob Bugatto
California Shell Fish Co.

Ken Burger
Franciscan Restaurant

Pat Flanagan
Standard Fisheries

Anthony Casali
Fishing Boat Norene

Virgil P. Caselli, Native S. Joseph Cincotta
F. Alioto Fish Co.
Nick D'Amato
Fishing Boat Nicky D
Nino Geraldi
Tom Lazio
Tom Lazio Fish Co.
Andrew Loll
William McDonnell
Albert Spadaro
Sports Fishing Boat
New Flories
Mario J. Alioto
Calif. Seafood Institute
Peter Brown
The Anchorage

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The opportunity is NOW!
Our Northern Waterfront is alive with activity—increase in passenger ships, thriving commercial developments.

Let us fuse that energy into our Southern Waterfront and take advantage of our natural deep water. That means newer, deeper draft merchant ships, increased cargoes and new jobs.

Missed opportunities cannot be recaptured. So act now! Don't let this opportunity get away.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Sec/Treasurer San Francisco Labor Council
Le Roy King
Regional Director ILWU
Tim Twork, President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trade Council
Chuck Mack, President
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our waterfront is an outstandingly beautiful and profitable aspect of San Francisco. The port has been badly neglected, however. We need to VOTE YES ON PROP A to improve and rebuild cargo and passenger facilities.

PROP A will guarantee increased maritime activities, new jobs, the revival of our fishing industry, and the safety of shoreline areas.

And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!
For our neighborhood, and for our City, VOTE YES ON PROP A!

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors

Phyllis Kern
Golden Gate Democratic Club* Open Space Committee*

Jim Wachob
District 8 Democratic Club*
Kevin Malone
District 8 Democratic Club*
Bette Landis
Democratic Women's Forum*
Rebecca Evans
Sierra Club*
Beverly Karnatz
Committee for Better Parks
and Recreation in Chinatown*

Richard Livingston
Addia Garabedian
Andrea Jepson
Madrid Hamilton
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Wallinda McCrea
Douglas Engmann
Dale Carlson
Stafford Buckley
Dick Pabich
Ron Huberman

*for identification purposes only
Port Revenue Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a great port city. And the San Francisco Port has always been a leading employer of minorities.

But the Port has sadly deteriorated. It has not kept up with modernizations and improvements. And what is even worse, it has not kept up with the competition. The Port MUST adapt to container cargo, and put in railway access to the docks. With your vote YES ON A, we can take advantage of our deep water harbor, attract more shipping trade, increase cargoes, and produce many more jobs.

And... AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!
VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Naomi Gray         Mabel Schine
Doris Thomas       Linda Dickens

J. E. Thomas
A. Brooks
Frankie Gillette
Lois DeCayette
Joel DeCayette
Jule Anderson
Althea Carrie
George Newkirk
Elouise Westbrook
Shirley Jones
Clifton Jeffers
Joe Williams
Carol Belle
Benjamin James
Grandvel Jackson
Amos Brown

Faye Anderson
Zuretti Goosby
Stan Palomares-Criollos
Jene Rita Alviar
Ernest C. Ayala
Alan S. Wong
Stan Moy
Douglas S. Chan
Thomas Hsieh
Alicia Wang
Ben Tom
Pius Lee
Julie Tang
Louis Hop Lee
Dennis Wong
Melvin Dong Lee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our Port now needs $42 million to develop San Francisco's maritime facilities to compete with ports such as Oakland, Seattle and San Diego.

These improved facilities are vital to San Francisco's competition for jobs and trade for the Pacific. Currently all major west coast ports are building to meet the growing needs of America's Pacific Trade. These ports have each spent an average of $57 million on recent container cargo expansion while San Francisco has spent nothing.

San Francisco must have at least comparable facilities in order to compete in this market. If the port is not developed for container cargo, San Francisco can forget about being a major port on the west coast as well as lose the jobs and revenue that a modern port could produce.

The Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that you vote to bring San Francisco the jobs and business that will be created by these revenue bonds. The bonds will be paid off from Port revenue and there is no taxpayer risk.

If you want to see the Port continue to grow and prosper vote yes on Proposition A.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reconstruct municipal harbor facilities!!!:

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

Juanita G. Raven
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committeeman
Bob Geary
Democratic County Committeeman
Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Martin Eng

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

When something is railroaded through City Hall on a “fast track”, it is always difficult not to join the stampede. This, however, is a bond issue in an amount larger than necessary to perform the actual work contemplated; not backed by written leases; and not backed even by “letter agreements” with corporations which supposedly will use Piers 80, 94 and 96 if improvements are made. This bond issue was rushed through the Board of Supervisors. Transmitted to the Board on July 24th, a scant six days later (on July 30th) and without a specific noticed public hearing, the Board voted 7-1 to place it on the ballot. I dissented because more time was needed for a proper analysis and public input.

Presently, the Port has a debt service requirement of approximately $104,000,000.00. This proposed revenue bond issue would increase the debt service requirement to $228,261,400.00; a staggering rise. The $42,500,000.00 bond issue would produce but $40,202,000.00 in net proceeds. The Port has a surplus of about $19,000,000.00, of which approximately $15,000,000.00 is available for capital projects. The Controller says $49,254,660.00 would thus be available for capital projects costing $41,610,000.00.

The Port is borrowing $7,644,660.00 more than is needed for these seven capital projects. Why? The Port admits it has no long-term written commitments for Piers 80, 94 and 96 which account for $37,570,000.00 of the total bond issue. How can we be assured that the bondholders will be repaid by revenues from those piers if there are no-long term commitments?

Moreover, the Port hasn’t even secured written “letter agreements” from corporations to assure that if those improvements are made, they will sign long-term commitments. Ironically, but $4,000,000.00 of the bond issue would be spent on needed improvements for Fisherman’s Wharf tenants, who generate almost 50% of net Port income, money which would be used to repay the money borrowed for Piers 80, 94 and 96. It’s like the tail wagging the dog.

Selling bonds is nothing more than borrowing money. Why borrow more money than you have to, and why borrow money for projects which don’t have long-term tenants? Be assured that even if this passes, I intend to persist in making Port officials answer those very questions.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

MOTION AUTHORIZING
PROPOSITION A

MOTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A MEASURE AUTHORIZING THE PORT COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS TO FINANCE THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION OF CERTAIN PORT FACILITIES TO BE LOCATED AT THE PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby orders submitted to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 6, 1984 a measure authorizing the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to issue revenue bonds, all as set forth in the following measure, to wit:

Shall the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $42,500,000 the proceeds of which will be used to modernize container handling facilities and to upgrade various other maritime-oriented facilities at the Port of San Francisco's piers 35, 80, 94 and 96 and at the Jefferson Street seawall, to construct a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf, to construct an intermodal container transfer facility, to install a backflow prevention system at various locations, to replace various transformers and capacitors throughout the port, and to acquire, construct or renovate certain works, property or structures necessary or convenient for the operation of, and at, the Port of San Francisco, which facilities are operated by the Port Commission?

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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USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Water Revenue Bonds

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department? YES 256 NO 257

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission operates the San Francisco Water Department. When the Commission needs funds to acquire, improve or develop Water Department facilities, it may issue revenue bonds to raise the funds. Before the Commission can issue revenue bonds, a majority of the voters must approve. The revenue bonds are then paid from Water Department revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds. Funds from the sale of the bonds would be used to acquire, improve or develop facilities necessary for the operation of the Water Department, including filtration plants and reservoirs. The bonds would be paid off from the revenues of the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance Water Department improvements.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Public Utilities Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

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

| Bond redemption | $104,000,000 |
| Bond interest   | 169,260,000 |
| Total debt service requirement | $273,260,000 |

“Based on a five year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning one year after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $3,467,000 to a maximum of $14,022,000 annually for thirty-one years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Water Department revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Water Department sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Water Department. Analysis of projected resources available to the Water Department indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on a resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The money from these bonds will be used to assure that drinking water we take from our Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs on the Peninsula is pure and meets all health standards. The bonds will be repaid from revenues of our Water Department. Not a penny will be charged on the property tax rolls or to the general taxpayers.

We have two huge lakes along side I-280 on the Peninsula, the Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs. About 15% of our drinking water in normal times comes from these lakes and others in Alameda County. For decades we used this water without filtration. Now, however, health officials tell us that all of the water from our Peninsula lakes must be filtered before it can be used. We now have a very limited filtering capacity which means that if, for any reason, our water supply from the Sierras were interrupted or reduced and we would need more local water, we would be unable to make full use of Crystal Springs water. There now is no filter plant at Crystal Springs. Whatever water we use from there must be pumped up to a small filtration plant at San Andreas before it can enter the system. This very severely limits the amount of drinking water we can draw from our nearest supply, and it is expensive. Passage of Proposition B would change all that.

By voting YES on B, you will provide for water system improvements including a new filtration plant right at Crystal Springs, for the expansion of the small plant at San Andreas, and for a necessary storage reservoir.

Your YES on B vote is an investment in the quality of our drinking water—an assurance that water from our nearest supply will be available to us pure, meeting all health requirements, when we need it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Generations ago, San Franciscans had the foresight to build one of the most magnificent water systems in the world—Hetch Hetchy, which brings water to San Francisco from the High Sierras.

Now, we must modernize the system to keep pace with higher standards of water quality. Proposition B will authorize the San Francisco Water Department to issue $104 million in revenue bonds.

The money will be used to improve the system by expanding existing plants and by building additional filtration, treatment and holding facilities on Water Department properties on the Peninsula.

These facilities will provide safe drinking water for future generations of San Franciscans. Presently, if any of the existing facilities suffered a breakdown, the City could be forced to rely upon unfiltered water from Crystal Springs. The State Department of Public Health has directed the Water Department to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Our water is safe. It meets all state and Federal quality standards, and we want to keep it that way. Proposition B will assure low turbidity (silt content), reduce asbestos content, and prevent the spread of giardia lamblia, a virus not now found in our water system, but which could be brought in as watershed areas become more populated.

Proposition B, which will not have any effect on our tax structure, is a prudent investment, protecting our drinking water into the future. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote yes on Proposition B and help guarantee us pure, plentiful water.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED
Health Commission

PROPOSITION C
Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Department of Public Health operates the county hospitals, such as San Francisco General and Laguna Honda, and all other county public health services. The Department is run by a Public Health Director, who is appointed by the City’s Chief Administrative Officer and who is responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would create a Health Commission, and place the Department of Public Health under the control of the Commission. The Commission would have seven members, appointed by the Mayor; no more than three members would be doctors, nurses, hospital administrators or other health care professionals. The Commission would appoint a Public Health Director, responsible to the Commission, to administer the Department. The Public Health Director could appoint and remove deputies to help administer the Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of a Health Commission appointed by the Mayor, and to be run by a Public Health Director, appointed by the Health Commission.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of the Chief Administrative Officer and to be run by a Public Health Director appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs of the Health Department, by approximately $8,400 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Public Health Department has a budget of over $270 million and a staff of 5000, making it the largest agency in City government. Its responsibilities are many and far-reaching: San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital; emergency medical services; mental health services; sanitation; public health education; district health centers; inspection of public and private facilities. The list is long and growing.

In recent years, the list of problems facing departmental administrators has, unfortunately, also grown. Emergency Aid stations were closed. Ambulance service was drastically altered. Proposals to reorganize community mental health services were promoted and rejected, causing confusion for all. The AIDS crisis. The investigations at San Francisco General Hospital. And on and on.

Too often, these decisions and these issues were considered in a vacuum, without public input, without public debate, and without public scrutiny.

Why? In order to protect the Department of Public Health from the graft and corruption that plagued our City at the turn of the century, the Charter placed the department under the Chief Administrative Officer's auspices rather than a commission. Fifty years later, the department has outgrown this cumbersome arrangement. It is time to bring the administration of this important agency into the 20th Century, mirroring the management of other City departments.

Proposition C will establish a seven-member Health Commission, appointed by the Mayor, to set policy and supervise the Public Health Department. The commission will include both providers and consumers of health services. It will bring the Department more directly under the Mayor's control, allowing for more timely responses to issues and problems. Most importantly, it will ensure that the department is publicly accountable for its actions.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Public health policy has changed and the governance of our public health department must change too.

In the past few years the state and federal governments have shifted more and more of the responsibility for public health management to local governments.

Recent experience shows that our health department is not presently equipped to manage public health programs in the most effective manner.

Proposition C will streamline management—cutting two levels of bureaucracy while opening up our public health policy to the public itself.

I urge a "yes" vote on Proposition C.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Since 1971, the Department of Public Health has been plagued with problems and crises at its hospitals, clinics and emergency aid stations. Most recently, we again faced the threat of San Francisco General losing its accreditation. These many incidents are deeply disturbing, raising troubling questions in the public mind: Why do these problems persist? Why can't something be done about them once and for all?

In 1979, the national organization that accredits all hospitals reported that San Francisco General's "major problems . . . are related to the lack of an effective governing body free from the political decision-making process which results in delayed activity, inadequate funding, etc." Last January, the State auditors also cited the absence of "a governing body legally responsible for hospital governance" as a cause for "ineffective management."

No other hospital in California operates without a board of directors. Only one other department in San Francisco (Public Works) operates without a commission. Instead, San Francisco General and the Health Department are run by a bureaucracy, insulated from public accountability.

Proposition C establishes a commission for the Health Department, one that will hold public hearing, make public decisions, and be publicly accountable. Vote YES.

Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Supervisor Louise Renne
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Harry Brit
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

(Continued)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's population is aging. In a few short years, a greater percentage of our citizens will be seniors—most living independently on fixed incomes, many frail and over 75—than those of other California cities. They will need nutritional information, home health care, and a broad range of coordinated social services.

The Department of Health, San Francisco General, Laguna Honda, the District Health Centers—these are critical providers of senior services. And as more and more state and federal programs are shifted to local agencies, the Department's role and responsibilities will dramatically increase.

How will the Department respond to this increased responsibility? How can we ensure that it will develop policies and programs that meet seniors' needs? And how can we be sure that these programs operate efficiently and effectively?

Proposition C is a big step in the right direction. VOTE YES!

Kathleen Lammers
Abraham Biderman
Jeanette Harris
Larry Bernardini, R.N.
Nancy Boughey, M.S.W.
David Lally, M.S.W.
Ollie Mae Black
Stephen Graham

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is important for women.

Women provide the majority of services offered by the Health Department. Indeed public health is traditionally the domain of women and nurses. And while the many crises at General are too often blamed on nursing care, nurses virtually have no role in planning or organizing service delivery.

Women are also the major consumers of the Depart-
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The policies governing San Francisco General affect every consumer and provider of health services in the City, yet there is little accountability to San Francisco taxpayers. No private hospital with General's size and influence operates without a board of trustees or directors. Indeed, no private organization of any kind with a $270 million annual budget—business, corporation, nonprofit foundation, whatever—operates without a governing board. Why does General?

As General bounces from one crisis to the next, with state and federal agencies threatening increasingly drastic actions, the weakness of the current management structure becomes clear to all. The Hospital and the Health Department need a commission, where public hearings can surface problems and issues in a timely fashion; where policies can be developed with the cooperation of private providers and consumers. The Health Commission will not be a watchdog meddling in day-to-day affairs, but an advocate for General, one providing continuity, stability and a rational decision-making process with regular rules and procedures.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is obligated to ensure that all San Francisco communities have access to medical services. The AIDS crisis brought the health care needs of gay men to the forefront of public discussion. It brought home the importance of a Department flexible and responsive to quickly emerging problems and epidemics, one capable of quickly reallocating resources to dire community needs.

The general health needs of gay men and women, however, are largely unrecognized. The Health Commission will give our community the voice it needs in the health planning processes. It will ensure that the diversity of our City is represented in the consideration of these important issues.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Hispanics in San Francisco strongly support Proposition C, the Health Commission Charter Amendment.

Health is vital to the Latino Community of San Francisco. We are a younger population, with larger families and with special health needs, such as those of Central American refugees. In recent years, federal and state funding for health programs has decreased, leaving community health programs in a difficult financial situation. Recent changes in Medically Indigent Adult services have also negatively impacted our community.

In addition, the need for better and expanded bilingual medical services continues to be a top priority in San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition C.
Health Commission

Sydney Furman
Carlos Castrillo
Leroy Jaquez
Estella Lara
Ricardo Hernandez
Igor Kalinovsky, M.D.
Bayra Matas
Andres Sendin
Consuelo Payes
Guadalupe Cuellar

Esperanza Martinez
Manuel Larez
Esperanze Echavarri
Stan Palomares-Criollos
Jene Alvin
Antonia Sacchetti
Maria Chavez
Maria Scinceux
Alicia Hopkinson
Clelia Fernandez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The chief opposition to Proposition C comes from two sources: The Chief Administrative Officer and the officials of the University of California Medical Center.

The CAO's opposition is understandable. He simply doesn't want to lose control of the Health Department and SF General.

UC's opposition is more puzzling, until you realize that it receives $10-15 million from the City each year for staffing at General Hospital without a publicly reviewed contract! Why is UC afraid of having its relationship with General publicly scrutinized by a Health Commission?

Let's clear the air. Vote YES on Proposition C.

Patie Fong
Ina Dearman
Patrick Flanagan
Douglas Engmann
Ellen Roberts
Christopher Martin
Tom Moore
Henry Der

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

We support Proposition C.

Fred Ross
James O'Connor
Dale Carlson
Pamela Duffy
Gerald Yochum
D.J. Soviero
Rosalind Wolf
Gordon Brownell
Jim Wachob
Steven Krefting
JoAnne Miller
Maura Kealey
Margaret O'Driscoll
Nicerita Reveco
Beatrice Patterson
Thomas Ambrogi
Arlo Hale Smith
Dian Blomquist
Thomas Moore
Peter Hanson
Jack Morrison
Mary Vail
Sally Osaki
Linda Post
Terrance Farr
Ken McEldowney
Sue Hestor
Willie Gee, D.D.S.
Agar Jaicks
John Holzclaw
Paul Vacaralli
Al Cassiato
Alan Raznick
James Haas
Al Borvice
Essie Webb
Joan Moulton
Russell Zellers
Stanley Shields
Richard Sevilla
Ann Daley
Dorothy Labudde
Dorice Murphy
Howard Strasser
Mark Davalos
Larry Griffin
Jay Wallace
Rob Waters
Kevin Malone
Jan Holloway
Norman Rolfe
Tom Jones
Barbara Halliday
Sandra Powell
Deborah Sarvis
Esther Marks
James Augustino
Sharon Johnson
Eileen Adams
Ruth Gravanis
Michael Heffer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Community clinics provide thousands of San Franciscans with access to essential primary health care and preventive health services. Yet, these community-based institutions, as well as the neighborhoods and people they represent, have been excluded from participation in health policy decision-making in San Francisco. Excluded, too, is any public debate on alternatives to hospital-based health delivery and financing systems that could prove cost-effective and could better serve the people of San Francisco.

Proposition C, The Health Commission Charter Amendment, offers a forum for public discussion of local health policy issues. By giving the neighborhoods and communities input into health policy decisions, the Health Commission will enable San Franciscans to create a new community of interest and new community of action in the area of health service delivery.

VOTE YES on PROPOSITION C.

San Francisco Community Clinic Consortium
Myles Dixon
George Dykstra
Susan Ehrlich
Patricia Franks
Debra Friedland
Kate Lambert
Mike Pincus
David Smith, M.D.
Marin Waukazoo
Jerome West
Sophie Wong

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

The Health Commission will be of vital importance to the Asian community. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

David Yamakawa
Ernest Wu
Joe Jung
George Suncin
Sophie Wong
Pattie Fong
Willie Gee, D.D.S.

Dr. Yoshio Nakashima
Louis Hop Lee
Samuel Chung

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is a key source of medical services in the black community, both directly through General Hospital and the district health centers, and indirectly through community and mental health clinics.

But our special problems—an infant mortality rate significantly above rates in other Bay Area counties, for example—are not often heard by the Department’s policy-makers, for they are insulated and isolated from our community.

Our concerns must be heard if they are to be ad-
dressed. Proposition C gives us a platform from which to speak. Vote YES.

Elouise Westbrook
Yvonne Golden
Lorenzo R. Dill
Zuretti L. Goosby, D.D.S
Jullianne Malveaux
Eugene Coleman
Naomi T. Gray

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This proposal to put politics into the Department of Public Health by creating a “commission” to direct it is an example of the misguided philosophy of attacking governmental problems by throwing bureaucracy at them. It should be soundly defeated. Currently, the City’s health officials report to one person, the Chief Administrative Officer, who can respond swiftly to any crisis and set consistent policy. The responsibility for the Department lies with the CAO, not a group of political appointees. When our Charter was adopted in 1932, the freeholders explained the rationale of giving the CAO management responsibility over the Health Department. The idea was “to provide reasonable safeguards AGAINST POLITICAL MANIPULATION.” (Emphasis added) Their report stated the office of CAO was designed to be “protected from political influence as largely as possible . . .” and “it is intended that this officer shall be entirely independent in discharging the function of the office, and particularly, to be free from interference of the mayor, because the latter is subjected to political influence.” Although the Charter was adopted in 1932, its logic still makes powerful sense. Besides blurring lines of responsibility, this iniquitous proposal contradicts health management practices in California and the United States. In fact, the same idea was evaluated in 1971 by a committee established by the supervisors, which concluded that the commission concept, a “seemingly attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitutes merely another bureaucratic layer in an already cluttered city administrative structure.” To paraphrase The Progress, the Muni is the best proof that “the presence of a commission does not guarantee good management.” Vote NO on Proposition C.

Supervisor 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.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The enactment of Proposition C would set the clock back on health care delivery in San Francisco to the 1920s. As proposed, the measure would almost exactly duplicate the system of Health Care abandoned by The City in 1932 because it had become corrupt, politicized and incapable of effectively responding to the growing challenges of modern health care administration.

In 1973 the Board of Supervisors itself considered and rejected a similar Health Commission option. The board's reason was that commissions do not make effective management tools. "The Commission, seemingly an attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another layer in an already cluttered City administrate structure."

The commission concept also goes counter to sound health management practices. Earlier this year, a team of top Bay Area health care professionals was asked to identify the leading municipal hospitals in the country. None of the institutions identified uses a commission form of administration largely because commissions, while perhaps capable of overseeing some urban systems such as mass transit, have proven ineffective and cumbersome.

The argument has been advanced that a commission would allow for greater citizen input into the health department. The fact is that the Department of Health already has some 440 individuals serving on 27 Citizen Advisory Committees—more than with any other city department. The proposed seven member commission would be insufficient in both size and technical competence to do other than deal with the health care in San Francisco on a "crisis-to-crisis" basis.

As we move into the 21st Century, the administration of San Francisco's health care systems will only become more challenging. A form of governance that proved inadequate 50 years ago and was rejected by the Board of Supervisors eleven years ago as inappropriate, is not the best way to provide for our city's health care needs of the future. We urge you to vote "No" on Proposition C.

Dr. Frank Lewis, Chief of Staff, San Francisco General Hospital
Walter Newman, Overseer, UCSF
Yori Wada, UC Board of Regents
Dr. Frank Curry, Former Director of Public Health
Dr. Frank Sooy, Chancellor Emeritus, UCSF
Virginia Leishman, Director of Nursing, Laguna Honda Hospital

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

A vote for Proposition C is a vote to politicize health care in San Francisco. The authors of the 1932 City Charter foresaw this when they abolished the city's highly politicized seven member health commission and placed the Department of Health under the jurisdiction of the Chief Administrative Officer. Proposition C would return San Francisco to the pre-1932 system of politicized health care management.

In writing the 1932 Charter, the authors recognized the need to balance executive authority by splitting it between the Mayor and the CAO. Departments, such as health, which were thought to be best managed if protected from direct political influence, were placed under the jurisdiction of the CAO, who is appointed for a fixed 10 year term to remove the office from political pressure.

Despite the occurrence of problems the system has worked well. San Francisco General has perhaps the best Trauma Unit in the country. The hospital's AIDS unit is unquestionably the best and most humane in the nation.

Moving control of the city's health care budget from the Chief Administrative Officer to the Executive will create a "strong mayor" type of government which the Charter was designed to prevent. Health commissioners would necessarily be beholden to the political factions or individuals which lobbied for their appointment and to the mayor who appoints them.

There are alternatives to a Health Commission. Several have already been recommended by a blue ribbon panel of health management experts appointed following the report on General Hospital. We believe these recommendations and perhaps others, including a variation on the health commission concept, deserve further study.

Proposition C would bring about a radical restructuring of government and health care delivery in San Francisco. Both issues are far too important to be decided hastily. We urge a No vote on Proposition C.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, President, Board of Supervisors
Florette White Pomroy, Consultant
William K. Coblenz, Attorney
Thomas E. Horn, VP, Board of Trustees, War Memorial
J. Gary Shansby, Chairman of the Board, Shaklee Corporation
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I oppose Proposition C because:

1. It puts the Health Department under the control of politically appointed non-professionals. I cannot agree that this should be done. It brings in politics and throws out expertise.

2. It adds an extra layer of bureaucracy making government more expensive and management more difficult.

 Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Your City Hall representatives would have you believe that by replacing our present Health System with a Health Commission, composed of seven members, at a recom pense of $100 per month, will improve the services.

Hogwash. Just another layer of government.

With a budget of $270 millions, 5000 employees would you put your faith in the hands of seven and still maintain the same Health Director?

What we need is a clean sweep of the present management; new faces; new ideas. The Charter provides for this, let's do it—"Now," not later.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION C

Marguerite A. Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

By creating a health commission for the Public Health Department, the city of San Francisco would create more problems rather than solve them.

Past experience has indicated a need to separate politics from health care. San Francisco would be turning the clock back to a situation in the 1920s when the city had a seven member commission appointed by the Mayor that oversaw the management of the Public Health Department. The delivery of effective health care was seriously compromised by the politicized department which was a direct consequence of the department's health commission.

For this reason, the citizens of San Francisco at that time passed a charter reform that removed the Health Department from the politically appointed commission and placed it in a newly created Chief Administrative Officer who would be secured against political pressures.

The creation of the Health Commission would take 40% of the budget of the Chief Administrative Officer's budget and place it under the control of a politically appointed Commission, thus negating the intent of the Chief Administrative Officer's Department which was created to administer departments that should be removed from political concerns.

Do not politicize San Francisco's health care. Vote No on Proposition C.

 John H. Jacobs
 Executive Director
 San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, Public Health, and County Agricultural Department; Health Advisory Board; Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the (Continued on page 82)
PROPOSITION D

Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?

YES 261
NO 262

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement Board has complete authority to invest the funds of the Retirement System for city employees. The Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would remove the requirement that the Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California. Instead, the proposition would require the Retirement Board to make investments with the care and skill that a prudent person would make under similar circumstances.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the way the Retirement Board invests pension money. Instead of making only those investments which are legal for insurance companies, the Board would be able to make any investments that a prudent person would make.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Retirement Board to keep making only the same kind of investments which are legal for insurance companies.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-5 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.


Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, increase the cost of government. However, as a result of its authorizing additional flexibility for investments, earnings may be higher or lower than what could have occurred absent this amendment.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 63.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote YES on Proposition D.
The purpose of Proposition D is to clarify the investment responsibility of the Retirement Board and to add language expressly to comply with the recently enacted State Constitutional amendment on fiduciary standards for public pension plans (Proposition 21, June 1984).

Since 1932, the charter has referred to the Insurance Code as the guideline for pension investments.

Insurance Code investment requirements are unsuitable to current pension fund investment practices and severely restrict the ability of the Retirement Board to manage the fund to achieve the best possible investment return for the City and County of San Francisco and the members of the Retirement System.

The added new language will establish firm guidelines for the Retirement Board to discharge its responsibility as the fiduciary for the Retirement Fund. This new language will also serve as increased protection for members of the Retirement System by applying recognized fiduciary standards for which there is considerable statutory and case law.

In summary, the proposed charter amendment serve a dual purpose: it removes obsolete and ambiguous language and brings the Retirement System into compliance with the State Constitution. Both changes will enhance and improve the System’s investment capabilities and the ability to achieve its goals and objectives.

Proposition D is endorsed and supported by the Retirement Board and the Board of Supervisors.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This is a worthwhile Charter amendment which updates obsolete and ambiguous provisions on how the Retirement Board can invest funds. It institutes standards consistent with a recent voter-approved amendment to the California Constitution. Investment practices have been refined dramatically in the past 50 years, and income and appreciation choices have increased tremendously. The investment professionals working for the Retirement System now are prevented from making the very prudent investments possible, and City employees and taxpayers are, thus, prejudiced and hurt.

Present investment rules are based upon the State Insurance Code, which contravenes contemporary investment practices. Proposition D will give more latitude in making high-return investments, but will also retain vigorous guidelines on investment of Retirement System funds while increasing the protection of City employees. It will save money for taxpayers by enabling a better return on Retirement System assets. It’s logical. That’s why I recommend a “yes” vote.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive, and may continue to receive, benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies in California.

The retirement board shall discharge its duties with respect to the system with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with these matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like aims.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ________________________________________________________________
Address ___________________________________________________________
Apt. # ______
Telephone No. (required) ____________________________________________
Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □
Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): ________________________________
Second choice locations (if any) _______________________________________

Signature __________________________________________________________
Surviving Spouse Benefits

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?

YES 264
NO 265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a health care fund for active and retired employees. The City's contribution to this fund equals the average amount contributed to health care funds for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco. The City does not contribute anything for spouses of active or retired employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would provide that the City contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for a least one year prior to the employee’s death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the health care fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Bill Maher.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs and present membership data of the Health Service System, in excess of $990,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 67.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This charter amendment calls for extending a limited measure of aid from the City and County of San Francisco for the health care of the surviving spouse of an active or retired City employee.

Under existing statute, the City and County and its employees, active or retired, share the cost of health care for the employee, their spouse and children. However, upon the death of the employee, the City and County’s share of payments to the health care system stops.

Thus, the surviving spouse is compelled to pick up the entire cost for the health care plan while struggling to survive on a reduced family income and, at the same time, contend with ever increasing medical/hospital expenses and everyday living costs for themselves and eligible family dependents.

Proposition E will allow the City and County to continue paying its share into the health care system and not force the surviving spouse and eligible family dependents to assume the entire financial burden for health care payments.

Since the number of surviving spouses affected is very small, less than 1400, the cost to the taxpayer for the City and County is minimal.

The changes proposed by Proposition E should have been made many years ago; it is long overdue. We urge you to support this important measure.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Justice tempered with compassion. VOTE YES. Surviving spouses of City workers receive an automatic 50% cut in retirement pay upon the death of their partners. Why further burden this small group by withdrawing subsidy for health care?

The Retirement System actuary has officially confirmed that the average pension check for this group is $300.00 per month; incidentally, below the nationally quoted poverty level.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by William T. Reed, Chairman
Legislative Committee, Retired Employees
City & County of San Francisco
Helen McAtee, Chairperson
Philip Kearney, President, and retired manager of the Health Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Health Service Board which administers the health benefits provided to active and retired employees and their dependents fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the surviving spouse upon the death of a retired employee.

This financial problem is especially acute because a surviving spouse’s pension is cut by 50% at the death of the employee and because of the high cost of medical insurance. Medical cost increases have outpaced general inflation rates over the last three (3) years by about two to one.

We urge your “YES” vote on Proposition “E” on the basis of need and equity.

Abraham Bernstein, M.D., President
Health Service Board of the City
and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Surviving spouses of city employees need this for a relatively comfortable widowhood. Let’s extend a small measure of consideration to those who are left on their own.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Proposition E if approved would require the city to subsidize the health premiums of the surviving spouses of non-uniformed city employees. The cost to the city would amount to $900,000 per year and give city employees a benefit that is not normally enjoyed by workers in private industry.

The majority of private employees have health plans that allow surviving spouses to be members of such plans but the employer does not subsidize the premiums of these survivors in anyway. Being permitted to join a group plan that provides comprehensive coverage at a reasonable rate is a sufficient benefit in and of itself.

If this amendment is approved it will violate the spirit of the Charter provision that sets city employee salaries and benefits at the average of that which prevails in the metropolitan Bay Area. We believe in fair treatment and compensation for city employees and our current rules provide exactly that.

Vote No on Proposition E.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of the average contribution as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8,423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to the average contribution as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8,423.

(b) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouse of a retired employee shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare, provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouse of active employees as is provided for active employee members.

(c) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8,425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8,401, 8,403, or 8,404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District, and the San Francisco Community College District, thereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments in this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1968 shall be effective July 1, 1969.
Employee Death Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?

YES  267
NO  268

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, who is a member of the Retirement System is entitled to a death benefit of six months salary if he or she dies, regardless of cause, before retirement. The benefit is paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would provide that if an officer or employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, is injured through external and violent means in the course of employment and the employee dies within 180 days of the injury, an additional benefit of 12 months salary would be paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to pay an additional benefit of 12 months salary to a city employee who dies from an injury caused by external and violent means in the course of employment.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to provide an additional death benefit to these city employees who die from external and violent means in the course of employment.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 69.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the number of employees and their respective salary rates which qualify for payment under the provisions of this proposed amendment. Based on experience to date, the cost of this additional amount should not be substantial.”
Employee Death Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F provides a small compensation for the survivor of a city employee (non Police or Fire) killed in the line of duty. Let’s agree to this minor expenditure for the survivors of those who have died in city service.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.
Only rarely is a city employee killed in the line of duty, but death can come with fierce suddenness.
Two Muni workers were crushed by cable car machinery in 1978; the following year, two Water Department employees were murdered at the Lake Merced Pumping Station; and in March 1981, a Hetch Hetchy lineman fell to his death.
For the families of the vast majority of city workers, there is little protection when death comes. Police officers and fire fighters already have special death benefits.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.
Proposition F is designed to correct a serious inequity on behalf of miscellaneous members of the Retirement System who are killed in line of duty or who die as a result of a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury.
Under current charter provisions, a designated beneficiary of a member who dies in the course of employment from any cause receives the member’s contributions to the system, plus six months’ salary.
Proposition F focuses only on those members who are killed in the line of duty or who die within 180 days from a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury. Beneficiaries of such members will be accorded an additional insurance benefit of twelve months’ salary.
The payment of additional compensation to a designated beneficiary will be subject to the independent hearing officer process as set forth in the City charter.
Proposition F is fair and equitable and, based on actuarial projections, the cost is minimal.
Proposition F is sponsored and endorsed by the Retirement Board, unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, and strongly supported by Mayor Dianne Feinstein.
Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

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

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

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

(Continued on page 84)

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

PROPOSITION G

Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers entering the Police Department serve a one-year probationary period. During the first 32 weeks, the police officer goes through the police training program. After successfully completing training, the officer is then assigned to regular police duties. The Police Department has 20 weeks to evaluate the officer while on regular police duty. After this 20 week period, the probation is complete.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would extend the probationary period of the police officer to one year after the completion of the training. In no event would it extend the probationary period beyond 84 weeks from the date of entry. Any termination for breach of duty or misconduct would require charges and a hearing before the Police Commission.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the probationary period for a police officer to be extended to one year after completing the police training course but not to exceed 84 weeks.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the probationary period for a police officer to remain one year after the date of entry into the department.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted "No."

Controller's Statement on "G"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 39.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Your YES vote for this amendment will enable the Police Department to provide more effective police services by ensuring that after officers graduate from the Academy and complete a field training program, an adequate probationary evaluation period exists to determine an officer's fitness to perform police duties. Society demands much from its police officers. As the nature of police work has become increasingly complex, training and performance evaluation functions must meet the needs of an ever-evolving profession. Great expenditure of time and money is invested in training police officers. Presently, if a recruit is not deemed ready for duty, the probationary period can be completed during any remaining, thus making it difficult and costly to determine ultimate fitness for duty.

By voting YES, you will give the Chief of Police time necessary to adequately train and evaluate an officer's performance and to better ensure quality police services.

The Police Department has met and conferred with the Police Officers' Association regarding this amendment and has obtained that organization's support for its passage.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Police Chief asked for a longer probationary period because it is needed. Vote yes.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition G. In recent years, because San Francisco has had the financial strength to do so, we've steadily expanded the size of the Police Department. It is now the largest ever, with 987 officers. More and more officers are being assigned to our neighborhoods on beats and in patrolcars. We want the best officers possible.

That's why Proposition G is so important; it will give the Department greater ability to screen our officers who do not measure up to the strict standards of professionalism this city demands.

Proposition G will extend the probation period for a new officer to one complete year following completion of his or her field training. Presently, probation starts when an officer is first inducted into the Department, before 15 weeks of initial work in the City's outstanding Police Academy and another 14 weeks of field training. As strenuous as the class work and the training may be, the real test of an officer is on the street. That's where his or her conduct, competence and compassion—in fact, all the qualities that this city wants in a superior police department—can be observed and tested.

Proposition G will give the Department a full year to evaluate an officer in uniform and on the job. Those who don't measure up can be dismissed after a departmental hearing. Proceeds will be the City's rightful concern that our police officers can truly be described as the City's finest.

Proposition G is a common-sense measure, sought by the Chief of Police, that will strengthen the San Francisco Police Department. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Lianne Hackbohm, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This is probably the most important proposition on the Fall ballot, a common-sense measure to be passed with the Police Department, which has the ultimate responsibility for the protection of persons and property in our community. It increases the probationary period of police officers by one year. As mentioned in our last letter, six men and women who graduate are of the highest quality possible. Right now, police officers graduate with about four months probationary period. That means they spend over 12 months probation at class and training and only four months on the street at the price

Police commissioners need more time to evaluate the recruit's "street" performance. Proposition G does that by extending the one-year probationary period up to one year. For the sake of our children, neighbors and all San Franciscans, I want to be sure that a police officer is fully competent from a professional standpoint, not merely because of his or her perspective. Therefore, I support Proposition G, and I urge you to vote for it too.

George B. Kopp, Supervisor
Police Motorcycle Pay

PROPOSITION H

Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?

YES 274
NO 275

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and who are assigned to the Traffic Division get bonus pay. Police officers who ride motorcycles as part of their job, but who are assigned to duties other than traffic, do not get bonus pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would give all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job to get the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want only those San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and are assigned to the Traffic Division to get bonus pay.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current rates of pay, staffing and assignments by the police department, the cost of government would be increased by approximately $74,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Honda Motorcycle Unit of the San Francisco Police Department has, because of antiquated charter language, been denied payment of the hazard pay which is currently given the two-wheel motorcycle officers in the Traffic Division.

Because the primary function of the Honda Motorcycle Unit is crime fighting and not traffic enforcement, the word “traffic” must be deleted from the charter in order to compensate equally all officers who perform hazardous motorcycle duty.

Please join us in voting YES for this very fair charter amendment.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

In 1970, the San Francisco Police Department created a unit of lightweight motorcycles to patrol Golden Gate Park and the beaches surrounding the City. In 1977 these duties were drastically changed to counteract rising street crimes around the Western Addition. Neighborhood associations, seeing the effectiveness of the unit, also requested additional patrols by these motorcycle officers. Since 1977 the Honda Unit (as it is known now) has been assigned to virtually every neighborhood in the City to reduce purse snatches, “red light” robberies, drag racing, and street narcotics traffic, along with demonstrations, marches, parades, and sporting events all over the City.

Also occurring since 1977 have been injuries to these highly visible, highly vulnerable motorcycle officers. Some of these injuries include one officer hit head on, and another officer suffering a leg broken by an auto which ran a red light. There have been numerous officers struck by other vehicles causing injuries, and injuries due to other road hazards (oil slicks, pothole etc.). These have increased sharply since the Honda Unit has been assigned to primarily street patrol. One officer was shot twice while patrolling the Western Addition for purse snatches.

It is obvious that these officers are no longer “just” patrolling the parks and beaches as they were initially intended, but are now assigned to patrol the streets of the most crime-ridden areas of the City combating street crimes and enforcing traffic laws. These officers on prior occasions have requested Motorcycle Hazard Pay (which traffic enforcement two-wheel motorcycle officers already receive) for their patrol of these neighborhoods and streets on the two-wheel motorcycles but have been denied because of outdated wording in the Charter. Passage of this amendment would correct this inequity.

Al Casciato
President, S.F.P.O.A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

All police officers who ride motorcycles in the course of duty face special danger and deserve the premium pay already allowed for motorcycle traffic officers.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

A police officer on a two-wheeler is often the first on the scene of a major crime or emergency. Day after day, there is no more hazardous duty for our police.

Whether on a motorcycle in pursuit of a felon on city streets, or on a motorbike on patrol in the remote areas of the City’s parklands, an officer lives with danger. Because they can cut through traffic, the two-wheelers often are first to arrive at a shooting or bank robbery or car crash.

The City Charter has long recognized the dangers inherent in this essential police work and has provided hazard-pay for motorcycle officers of the Traffic Division.

Proposition H simply extends hazard-pay to the 17 or so officers on the equally perilous motorbike detail.

The amount of money involved is small—only $178 a month for each officer. Proposition H is small recognition of the dangers the police daily face in the line of duty. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor
Military & Social Spending Initiative

PROPOSITION I

(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco does not have an official position on whether federal taxes should be used for certain kinds of defense spending.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I says the Board of Supervisors must inform the President and certain other federal officials that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether they want their tax dollars used for certain kinds of “excessive military expenditures”, as defined in the measure. Proposition I also says the City’s Chief Administrative Officer must publish an annual report on the amount of federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents, what portion of these taxes are used for military spending, and what portion are used for social or human needs. The Board of Supervisors would appoint a seven-member Citizens’ Advisory Committee to oversee the preparation of the report.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you think federal officials should be told that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending. You also want the City to publish an annual report on how federal tax dollars collected from San Francisco residents are spent.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t think taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending, and you don’t want the City to publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition relating to military and social expenditures had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The proponents of the petition had gathered 12,271 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 2. The proponents are officially listed as G.C. Barnes, L.J. Crowe, H.J. Hobi and R.A. Wall.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,304 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time but should not be substantial.”

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 75.
Military & Social Spending Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This initiative should be passed because it educates people about excessive military spending and sends a clear message to the Federal Government that people want a choice as to how their taxes are spent.

Homer Hobi
Chairperson
The Humanist Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why waste taxpayers' money for a handful of misguided individuals?
City government is mandated to govern local citizens affairs.

Martin Eng
School Board Candidate

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION I

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

Section 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following terms are defined:

(a) Excessive military expenditures: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is destined for research, development, and production of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons; research, development, and production of outer space laser-beam technology weapons (popularly known as "star-war" weapons); research, development, and production of chemical and biological warfare; military aid, both overt and covert, to undemocratic and/or repressive governments (governments that violate the basic human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948 by the United Nations).

(b) Social or human needs: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is used for education, housing, health and human services, public transportation, and the arts.

(c) San Francisco taxpayer: any individual who pays federal taxes and who reports his or her principal place of residence within the San Francisco city limits; and any corporation who is considered by the Internal Revenue Service as residing in San Francisco.

(d) Portion of revenues in 3(a) budgeted for social or human needs;
(e) Average individual tax contribution;
(f) Average individual tax contribution allocated to (1) excessive military expenditures and (2) social needs.

The Board of Supervisors shall appoint a Citizen's Advisory Committee every year to oversee the preparation of the report and to ensure that its findings are accurate and impartial. The Citizen's Advisory Committee shall consist of seven members, at least three of whom shall be volunteers from renowned Peace organizations in San Francisco.

The report shall use the most current figures available from the federal government at the time of publication, citing the sources for the computations. If the necessary tax and budgetary breakdowns for San Francisco were not available, the report shall base itself upon tax revenue and budgetary figures for the entire nation (or subdivision thereof) and produce accurate extrapolations.

The Chief Administrative Officer shall publish the report in the two newspapers of largest circulation in San Francisco, no earlier than 14 days before but no later than the normal deadline for the filing of federal income taxes for individuals.
PROPOSITION J

(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?

YES 283

NO 284

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco has no policy about the investment of pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco and its agencies not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa. This would be the official policy until Black people are given full political and civil rights by the government of South Africa.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want it to be the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City and County of San Francisco to have an official policy against investing pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

How "J" Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition on South African investment policy had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Julianne Malveaux, the official proponent of the petition drive, had gathered 11,404 signatures which she turned in to the Registrar on August 8.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,520 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, investment income may be affected in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount.”

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We support removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa because we believe the city of San Francisco should not support the reprehensible institution of apartheid. Non-whites in South Africa are denied freedom of association, freedom of mobility, freedom of speech, and voting rights. San Franciscans support this inequality when city pension funds are invested in companies that do business with South Africa.

This investment is also a very risky investment since any civil unrest in South Africa may lower the value of the investment. Other investment possibilities will equal or exceed current yields on the pension portfolio.

We support this initiative because we support equal rights for all, and because we believe in prudent investment of city pension funds.

San Franciscans for Responsible Investments
Julianne Malveaux, Chair
Essie Mormen, Co-Chair
Henry Clark, Co-Chair
Arlo Hale Smith, Treasurer

Hon. Sala Burton
Hon. Harry Britt
Hon. Doris Ward
Hon. Richard Hongisto
Hon. Nancy Walker
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Louis Hopp Lee
Kim Corsaro
Roberto Hernandez
Bruce St.Cyr
Tim Lennon
Beatrice Eisman
Joan Apodaca
Wardell Jackson
Susan Englander
Henry Der
Sue Hestor
Ida Strickland
Bradford Paul
Daniel Moses
National Labor Relations
Board Union Local 20

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

By supporting Proposition J, San Franciscans join citizens from fourteen other cities, including Washington, D.C., Boston, and Berkeley, in removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa. Our support strikes a blow against the apartheid policy that has denied Black and non-white people equal rights in South Africa.

Removing pension funds from South Africa makes good economic sense. International investment advisors recommend against such investment because of the frailty of the South African political situation. Significantly, none of the cities that have divested funds from South Africa have had lower earnings since divestment.

It is both morally just and fiscally sound to vote YES for Proposition J!

Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Economics
S.F. State University
Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud that we were the first state in the nation to vote to sell from our public pension fund portfolio all investments in firms doing business in South Africa. Since the passage of this landmark legislation, it has been our experience that divestiture makes not only a strong moral statement against apartheid, but divestiture has proven to have had no negative impact on our pension earnings.

I urge San Franciscans to give serious consideration to both the moral and the financial arguments as you consider divestiture as a policy of your great city.

Michael Dukakis
Governor, Massachusetts
Submitted by John Burke
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For over a decade individuals and institutional investors, including local and state governments, universities, foundations, churches, Taft-Hartley pension funds and health and welfare plans have refused to invest in, and divested from corporations and financial institutions economically supporting apartheid in South Africa. They are investing and earning competitive returns in housing, small business, alternative energy, and other socially productive investments which create employment and prevent capital from being exported to South Africa.

It is fiduciarily irresponsible to risk beneficiaries' pension assets by investing in companies in South Africa. Many trade and corporate risk analysts have recommended no investment exposure in South Africa. The Rockefeller Study Commission on U.S. policy toward Southern Africa, recently recommended no new corporate investments in that white, minority ruled country.

Vote to create jobs, housing and small business in your community, not apartheid in South Africa. Vote YES on Proposition J.

John Harrington, President Working Assets Money Fund

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

"For the sake of the children of all South Africans, black and white, for God's sake, for the sake of world peace, the international community must take action, it must exert pressure on South Africa—political pressure, diplomatic pressure and above all, economic pressure." (Bishop Desmond Tutu, General Secretary-South African Council of Churches, 1981)

The apartheid system continues because of Western support. The South African Council of Churches has said "foreign investors must know they are investing to buttress one of the most vicious systems since Nazism." As members of the international religious community, we can no longer let others make decisions which contradict all that we believe in. We urge San Franciscans to vote yes on Proposition J as a specific, responsible way to express their moral rejection of apartheid.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I support Proposition J and encourage a statewide effort to remove pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON "J" STATEMENT BY UNION OFFICIALS

The United Nations General Assembly declared South African apartheid "a crime against humanity"; and that investment in South Africa "encourages the apartheid policies of that country".

Representatives of several hundred million unionists, meeting under UN -ILO auspices, called for the elimination of stocks of companies investing in South Africa, from pension funds.

As unionists and human rights advocates we support this measure.

Rev. Cecil Williams
Dr. Thomas Ambrogi
Dr. Norman Leach
Rev. Glenda Hope
Rev. Jean Richardson
Rev. Robert Cromey
Rev. Stanley Stefancic
Rev. James Clairor
Rev. Pamela White
First Congregational Church
Rev. Kenneth Westray
Rev. Prigiono Walker
Rev. Charles Lewis
Rev. Matthew Fong
Rev. Donald Stuart
Rev. Lloyd Wake

Lia Belli
Democratic Candidate,
State Senate

Committee for International Support of Trade Union Rights
Charles Lamb
Anthony L. Ramos
Jack Goldberger
Curtis Mc Clain
Frank Souza
Stanley M. Smith
Mary Anne Petersen
Timothy J. Twomey
Walter L. Johnson
Jack Henning

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

To protect American interests and to halt the spread of Communist influence into South Africa, responsible action is needed to end legally-required racial segregation and to reasonably extend voting rights.

Proposition J is an important step towards a moderate solution of the South African problem.

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman

Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee

Todd Roust
Republican State Senate Nominee

Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

WARNING TO VOTERS

Disregard any self-serving statements by Peter Ashe, Meta Stanley, and their controversial Retirement Board in connection with Proposition J.

The Retirement Board has done more than just aid South Africa by its investment policies.

The Retirement Board has made serious investment errors, produced poor investment yields, and run up market value investment portfolio losses of $160,852,320 (as of 3/30/84) with Prudential-Bache.

One Retirement Board “success” was the purchase of 10,000 shares of Citicorp for $3,473,320. The shares on 3/30/84 were worth $340,000 (90% loss).

Mike Garza
Robert Silvestri
Max Woods

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Rainbow Coalition and all members, support this initiative. Stop investments of San Francisco pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. Support Human Rights. People have a right to know that their pension funds are being used to support a racist, repressive, apartheid system, that denies basic human and civil rights to 24 million Africans. We have a right to know that a Black man can be detained in the South African penal system for as long as two years, for not having identification. That Black people there are denied the right to vote, buy or sell land, and the right to live or work where they choose. Support Human Rights. Vote in favor of prop. J.

Gale White
African American of the Rainbow

Rev. Howard Gloyd
Northern California Chairman

The Rainbow Coalition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco CISPES supports the removal of city pension fund investments from firms that profit from apartheid.

The government of South Africa, like the government of El Salvador, denies its people the most basic human rights: freedom from arbitrary arrest and torture; freedom of speech and association; and the right to a decent standard of living.

In 1983, San Franciscans said no to military aid to El Salvador. In 1984, let us say no to investments in South Africa.

San Francisco Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Apartheid continues to be used to enslave black working people in South Africa. International labor has consistently condemned apartheid, and agrees that divestment from South Africa is an effective means of pressure.

David Aroner, Executive Director
SEIU Local 535
Timothy Twomey, Secretary-Treasurer
Hospital and Institutional Workers
Local 250
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director
United Public Employees Local 390/400
SEIU

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For the Black majority, apartheid in South Africa means no right to vote, unionize or speak out. Those who resist are murdered, tortured and imprisoned. Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, has been imprisoned for over twenty years. Apartheid is fascism!

U.S. companies investing in South Africa profit from low wages paid to Black workers, and play a key role in keeping apartheid alive. Say NO to apartheid and racism—Vote YES on Prop J.

Henry Clark, Candidate for Congress, Fifth Congressional District
Gloria La Riva
All-Peoples’ Congress
Johnnie Stevens
Southern Africa Freedom Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Joint Council of the Service Employees International Union has unanimously endorsed this proposal. The Union took this action because of the economic oppression of citizens by the South African Government, because of the termination of trade union rights and the arrest of union leaders, and because of the moral “Crime against humanity” of Apartheid.

Timothy J. Twomey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

South African apartheid is condemned the world over. Even the Reagan Administration expresses opposition.

Yet South Africa and apartheid continue to flourish, subjecting all non-whites to the vilest humiliations, discrimination, and exploitation.

San Francisco supports apartheid through our investment of municipal pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. By their very presence there, these companies maintain the status quo. Otherwise, the ruling white minority would not welcome these investments! We allow apartheid to continue, despite all the rhetoric we direct at South Africa.

San Franciscans can make responsible investments elsewhere. Voting YES on J, we join other cities in cutting the taproot—foreign finance—which allows the horrors of South Africa to go on, and on, and on. . . . End it! Vote YES, against apartheid!

Executive Committee
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY A PROPOSITION OF ISSUING REVENUE BONDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.312 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $104,000,000 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, FINANCING, IMPROVING AND DEVELOPING WATER DEPARTMENT FACILITIES; AND CONSOLIDATING SAID SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 1984.

WHEREAS, Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the Board of Supervisors in each instance, the Public Utilities Commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities of the San Francisco Water Department subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of Charter Section 7.300; in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco by resolution No. 84-0363 adopted July 24, 1984, pursuant to said Section 7.312, has recommended that the Board of Supervisors, by resolution submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held for that purpose on November 6, 1984, the proposition of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, as it read on June 5, 1984, and Charter Section 7.312 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission in said resolution 84-0363:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

Section 1. A special revenue bond election is hereby ordered and will be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 6, 1984, at which election there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County the proposition of issuing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of providing funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, all as set forth in the following proposition:

Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds.

Shall the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to Charter Section 7.312 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing additions, betterments and improvements to the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system, including filtration and treatment works and plants, reservoirs and other water supply, storage and distribution facilities, tanks and equipment necessary or convenient for the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system?

Section 2. Said revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 (herein called the "Bond") are proposed to be issued to finance improvements to an enterprise (herein called the "Enterprise") which is herein defined to be the City and County of San Francisco municipal water system, including all of the presently existing municipal water system of the City and County and all additions, betterments, extensions and improvements thereto. Said existing water system and the proposed improvements thereto shall constitute a single, uniform integrated enterprise, and the revenue bond election shall be held on the same day as the election for the issuance of the Bonds. It is hereby found and determined that said municipal water system is necessary to enable the City and County to exercise its municipal powers and functions, namely, to furnish sufficient water for any present or future beneficial use of the City and County.

(a) The purpose for which the Bonds are proposed to be issued is to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, including any expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith.

(b) The estimated costs of the acquisition, construction, financing, improvement and development is $104,000,000. Said estimated cost includes all costs and expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, engineering, inspection, legal and fiscal agents' fees, cost of the revenue bond election and of the issuance of the Bonds, bond reserve funds, and working capital and bond interest estimated to accrue during the construction period and for a period of not to exceed 12 months after completion of construction.

(c) The maximum principal amount of the Bonds proposed to be issued is $104,000,000.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco the said special revenue bond election the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution, and designates and refers to said proposition in the form of ballot language prescribed for use at said election.

(a) Said special revenue bond election shall be held and conducted, and the votes thereon canvassed and the returns thereof made, and the result thereof ascertained and determined as herein provided; and in all particulars not described by this resolution, said special election shall be held and the votes canvassed pursuant to law for general municipal elections in the City and County and pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 3 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) All persons qualified to vote at municipal elections in the City and County upon the date of the election herein provided for shall be qualified to vote upon the proposition submitted at said special revenue bond election.

(c) Said special revenue bond election is hereby consolidated with the general municipal election to be held in the City and County on November 6, 1984, pursuant to the Charter of the City and County. The precincts, polling places and officers of election for said special revenue bond election shall be the same as those established.
and designated for said general municipal election. Reference is hereby made to the notice of election by the Registrar of Voters setting forth the precincts, polling places and officers of election for said general municipal election, to be published on or about October 15, 1984 for more particular description of said precincts, polling places and officers of election.

(d) The ballot used at said general municipal election and said special revenue bond election hereby consolidated therewith shall have printed thereon, in addition to all other matters required by law, the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution.

(e) Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

If to the extent that voting machines are used at said special revenue bond election such machines shall be so arranged that any qualified voter may vote for said proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "YES" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for said proposition, and may vote against it by pulling down a lever over the word "NO" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote against said proposition. The statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material used in voting machines shall read substantially as follows:

$104,000,000 San Francisco Water Department Revenue Bonds,

Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with law.

Section 4. If the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution shall be authorized by the qualified voters of the City and County by the votes of a majority of all the voters voting on said proposition, the Bonds may be issued and sold for the purpose set forth in Section 2 of this resolution.

The Bonds are to be revenue bonds, payable exclusively from the revenues of the Enterprise and such other funds from any source as may be legally available for such purpose and may be used by the City and County for such purpose without incurring indebtedness. The Bonds are not to be secured by the taxing power of the City and County, and shall be issued under Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County. The principal of and interest on the Bonds and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof shall not constitute a debt of the City and County, nor a legal or equitable pledge, charge, lien or encumbrance upon any of its property, or upon any of its income, receipts or revenues except the revenues of the Enterprise and any other funds that may be legally applied, pledged or otherwise made available to their payment. The Bonds, if authorized, shall be special obligations of the Public Utilities Commission and shall be secured by a pledge and shall be a charge upon, and shall be payable, as to the principal thereof, interest thereon, and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof, solely from and secured by a lien upon the revenues of the Enterprise and such funds as may be described in the resolution authorizing the issuance of the Bonds.

The Bonds shall not constitute or evidence indebtedness of the City and County but shall constitute and evidence only an indebtedness of the Public Utilities Commission payable solely out of revenues received by the Public Utilities Commission from San Francisco Water Department facilities operated or controlled by it. The Bonds shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in Section 6.401 of the Charter.

Section 5. This resolution shall be printed in the voters' pamphlet and mailed to each registered voter pursuant to Section 9.105 of the Charter of the City and County.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C, Continued from page 61

bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, a deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy or other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

The department of public works shall have powers and duties relating to street traffic, subject to the laws relating thereto, as follows:

(a) to cooperate with and assist the police department in the promotion of
traffic safety education;

(b) to receive, study and give prompt attention to complaints relating to street design or traffic devices or the absence thereof;

(c) to collect, compile, analyze and interpret traffic and parking data and to analyze and interpret traffic accident information;

(d) to engage in traffic research and traffic planning; and

(e) to cooperate for the best performance of these functions with any department and agency of the city and county and the state as may be necessary.

The department shall submit to the traffic bureau of the police department, for its review and recommendation, all proposed plans relating to street traffic control devices; provided, however, that the bureau may waive submission and review of plans of particular devices designated by it. Failure of the said traffic bureau to submit to the department its recommendation on any proposed plan within fifteen (15) days after receipt shall be considered an automatic approval of said traffic bureau. The department shall not, with respect to any traffic control devices, implement such plan until the recommendation of the traffic bureau has been reviewed or until the fifteen (15) day period has elapsed.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county upon paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendation of the chief of the department.

Department of Public Health, which shall be administered by a director of health, who shall be a regularly licensed physician or surgeon in the State of California, with not less than 10 years' practice in his profession immediately preceding his appointment thereto, provided, however, that the physician or surgeon requirement may be waived by the board of supervisors. He shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The chief administrative officer shall have power to appoint and to remove an assistant director of public health for hospital services, who shall be responsible for the administrative and business management of the institutions of the department of public health, including, but not limited to, the San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Home, Hassler Health Home, and the Emergency Hospital Service, and who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of assistant director of public health for hospital services shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the institutions of the department of public health.

The director of public health shall have power to appoint and remove an administrator of San Francisco General Hospital who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of administrator shall be held only by a physician or hospital administrator who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the San Francisco General Hospital.

Health Advisory Board. There is hereby created a health advisory board of seven members, three of whom shall be physicians and one dentist, all regularly certified. Members of the board shall serve without compensation. They shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer for terms of four years, provided, however, that those first appointed shall classify themselves by lot so that the terms of one physician and one lay member shall expire in 1933, 1934 and 1925, respectively, and the term of one member in 1926.

Such board shall consider and report on problems and matters under the jurisdiction of the department of public health and shall consult, advise with and make recommendations to the director of health relative to the functions and affairs of the department. The recommendations of such board shall be made in writing to the director of health and to the chief administrative officer.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center.

If in the election of June 3, 1980 November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

PART TWENTY-ONE: HEALTH COMMISSION

3.95 Composition of Department; Commission

The public health department shall consist of a health commission, a director of public health and such employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter. The department shall be under the management of a health commission consisting of seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor. Said commission shall have less than a majority of direct providers of health care. Direct providers of health care shall mean all
health professionals and others whose "primary current activity" is the provision of patient care or the administration of facilities or institutions which provide patient care. The term of each member of the commission shall be four years, commencing at twelve o'clock, noon, on the 15th day of January in the year 1985; provided, that the respective terms of office of those first appointed shall be as follows: two for four years, two for three years, two for two years, and one for one year. Vacancies occurring on said commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of each of said members shall be filled by the mayor. No commissioner may serve more than two consecutive terms or a total of eight years.

The compensation of each commissioner shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month. The commissioners shall annually elect one of their members president. They shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the governance of the commission.

3.696 Director of Public Health; Other Executives

The health commission shall appoint a director of public health who shall serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The director of public health shall be a regularly licensed physician in the State of California, with not less than five years' experience in public health administration immediately preceding his or her appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician requirement may be waived by the health commission. The director of public health shall be the chief executive of the commission and shall, subject to the approval of the commission, manage all operations under its jurisdiction. The director shall have power to appoint and remove a deputy director for operations, a deputy director for community health programs, an administrator for San Francisco General Hospital and an administrator for Laguna Honda Hospital. The administrators of San Francisco General Hospital and of Laguna Honda Hospital shall have power to appoint and remove associate administrators to the extent such positions are created by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

These positions shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter and shall be held by persons who possess the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the divisions and institutions of the department. However, any person who has civil service status in any of the above positions on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have such status under the civil service provisions of this charter. All positions in the department legally authorized shall be continued and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.697 Powers and Duties

The health commission shall manage and control the city and county hospitals, emergency medical services, and all matters pertaining to the preservation, promotion, and protection of the lives, health and mental health of the inhabitants of the city and county, except where this charter specifically grants that power to another department. It may also determine the nature and character of public health nuisances and provide for their abatement.

The commission shall inspect the sanitary conditions of the municipal institutions of the city and county, including jails and all public buildings; of the disposition of the dead; of the disposition of garbage, offal and offensive substances.

The commission shall be a policy-making and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in section 3.500 of this charter. The commission shall have the power to establish and make appointments to advisory committees as it shall deem necessary.

8.107 Suspension and Removal

Any elective officer, and any member of the civil service commission, health commission, or public utilities commission or school board may be suspended by the mayor and removed by the board of supervisors for official misconduct, and the mayor shall appoint a qualified person to discharge the duties of the office during the period of suspension. On such suspension, the mayor shall immediately notify the supervisors thereof in writing and the cause therefor, and shall present written charges against such suspended officer to the board of supervisors at or prior to its next regular meeting following such suspension, and shall immediately furnish copy of same to such officer, who shall have the right to appear with counsel before the board in his defense. Hearing by the supervisors shall be held not less than five days after the filing of written charges. If the charges are deemed to be sustained by not less that a three-fourths vote of all members of the board, the suspended officer shall be removed from office; if not so sustained, or if not acted on by the board of supervisors within thirty (30) days after the filing of written charges, the suspended officer shall thereby be reinstated.

The mayor must immediately remove from office any elective official convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, and failure of the mayor so to act shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part.

Any appointee of the mayor, exclusive of civil service, health, recreation and park, and public utilities commissioners, and members of the school board, may be removed by the mayor. Any nominee or appointee of the mayor whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, except the chief administrative officer and the controller, as in this charter otherwise provided, may be removed by a majority of such board and with the concurrence of the mayor. In each case, written notice shall be given or transmitted to such appointee of such removal, the date of effectiveness thereof, and the reasons therefor, a copy of which notice shall be printed at length in the journal of proceedings of the board of supervisors, together with such reply in writing as such official may make. Any appointee of the mayor or the board of supervisors guilty of official misconduct or convicted of crime involving moral turpitude must be removed by the mayor or the board of supervisors, as the case may be, and failure of the mayor or any supervisor to take such action shall constitute official misconduct on his or their part.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F — Continued from page 69

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

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

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the re-
The compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection F (f) of this section shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this subsection B (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this subsection B (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said subsection F (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of sixty years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty years, computed under subsection G (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection G (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed seventy-five percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection C (c) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within thirty days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of sixty-five years may elect, without right to revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month upon retirement after thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty years, and provided further that as to any member within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for
each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

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

\( \mathcal{D} (d) \) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

\( \mathcal{E} (e) \) If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause:

1. If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection \( \mathcal{E} (e) \):

   a. \( (A) \) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his contributions and interest credited thereon.

   b. \( (B) \) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

\( \mathcal{F} (f) \) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system,
provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least ten years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000), he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, ninety 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus one and two-thirds (1 2/3) percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

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

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

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7 1/2) percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(1).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection G (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

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

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision § (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this section 8.509 contained in the proposition thereafter submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of thirty 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provision of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debts against the city and county.

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

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

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

§ (i) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection B (b), e (c), F (f) and § (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(M) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments; no such they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1982, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1982, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature.

The total of the payments of allowances made pursuant to this Subsection (b) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subsection (a) of this section, the amount of said benefit payable under Subsection (a) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowances made pursuant to this Subsection (b) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

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

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

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subsection (a) of this section in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this section, and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so...
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

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

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 twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve 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 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four 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 thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated in his position without prejudice, and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of his appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which he was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotional classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall 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.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments.
(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco. Thereupon the Board of Supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its
duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in Section 3.531 of this Charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in Section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in Section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by Section 8.361 of this Charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in section (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors the rates of compensation paid to firemen firemen firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall
be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter. For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firemen” “firefighters” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective rate of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his such member’s service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patroons, patrol officers or firemen; firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uni-
formed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975–76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

**IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT VOTING**

You can vote for any candidate, regardless of party. This is a General Election and you can vote for any candidate on your ballot. Political party restrictions only apply at Primary Elections (in June).

Do not vote for more than the authorized number of candidates or none of your votes for that contest will be counted. Most candidate contests specify "Vote for one" but you can vote for up to six supervisors and up to four School and College Board members. If you make a mistake and vote for more than six candidates for supervisor you can get a replacement ballot.

If you move, you must re-register. The most common complaint we get on election day is that someone can't vote because they have moved and not re-registered. If you have moved, your name will probably not be on the rolls anymore and even if it is, it is not legal to vote using your old polling place (except in certain rare circumstances). Next time you move, don't leave your vote behind; remember to re-register.

You don't have to be sick or out-of-town to get an absentee ballot. Any voter can request an absentee ballot for any reason, or for no reason. To become a "permanent" absentee voter you must be disabled but ordinary absentee voters do not have to have a reason.

Your registration will not necessarily be cancelled if you don't vote but chances of that happening will increase if you don't vote. After the election, we will send a postcard confirming the address of all nonvoters. If the Post Office or the current resident says you don't live there anymore, your registration will be cancelled. No one is automatically cancelled for not voting at any election.

It is not necessary to re-register before each election. Your registration is permanent and will remain in effect until you move, die or are convicted of a felony.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

STEP 1

Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.

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

STEP 2

Be sure the two slots in the stub of your card fit down over the two red pins.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta 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 perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

STEP 4

After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y pongala bajo el cierre del sobre.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ________________________________
Address ______________________________ Apt. # ______
Telephone No. (required) __________________________
Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): ______________________
Second choice locations (if any) ______________________________

Signature ________________________________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER’S BALLOT

I hereby apply for an absentee voter’s ballot:

For Registrar’s Use Only

Election Date

A.V. Prec. No.

Ballot Type

Affidavit No.

Signature and Registration

Verified as Correct:

Date

Deputy Registrar

Printed Name-LETTRAS DE IMPRENTA

Firma

Date-Fecha

Residence Address-Residencia Direccion

Please mail ballot to me at:

Mailing address, if different from above

Por favor envíe la boleta por correo:

Dirección Postal (si es diferente)

Resident’s Address

Type or Print Clearly or Your Request Will Not Be Honored

Permanent Absentee Voter

I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

Description of Handicap/Disability

Voter’s Initial

Extra Application for Absentee Ballot

Since this page would have been blank anyway, we have used the space to reprint an extra copy of the absentee ballot application form.

Your "real" absentee ballot application appears as a postcard inserted into this book. We would prefer that you use the postcard form because it is easier to process and less likely to get lost.

If two persons in your household are requesting absentee ballots, you may put both postcard forms into an envelope in order to save postage.

The disabled may apply as permanent absentee voters by completing the little box at the bottom of the form. Disabilities that qualify for permanent absentee status include circulatory problems and mobility impairments as well as more severe disabilities.

If you have not yet received your absentee ballot, then you are probably not on our permanent absentee mailing list. The permanent absentee voters' ballots were mailed out the week of October 9th.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

5th Congressional District
17th Assembly District
(No State Senate)
(BART)

Application for absentee ballot appears on Page 48
Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊在第48頁

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

November 6, 1984
General Election
Compiled by
Jay Patterson
Registrar of Voters

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALLOT BOX
GENERAL INFORMATION
Voting Instructions 3, 18
Sample Ballot 4-17
Your rights as a voter 19
Words you need to know 20
Handicapped information 20, 96
Absentee Ballot Application card
Voter Selection Coupon card
Location of your Polling Place 96

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR
John Saleh Abdulla 22
Suzanne A. Alberto 22
Roger Boscetti 23
Richard Bradley 23
Harry G. Britt 24
Randall D. Bronner 24
Jonathan Bulkley 25
Diana Coleman 25
Eleanor M. Davis 26
Edward Michael Hayes 26
Robert D. Ingraham 27
Ruby T. Jimenez 27
Andrew (Daddy Andy) Jones 28
Willie B. Kennedy 28
Ellis L.A. Keyes 29
David L. Kilber 29
Quentin L. Kopp 30
Julian Lagos 30
Julianne Malveaux 31
John L. Molinari 31
Pat Norman 32
Joseph J. Phillips 32
Louise Renne 33
Carol Ruth Silver 33
David C. Smith 34
Kevin Starr 34
John E. Wahl 35
Sylvia Weinstein 35
Dave Wharton 36

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION
Dick Cerbatos 37
Christopher Christenson 37
Libby Deneheim 38
George Dykstra 38
Martin Eng 39
Dr. Eugene S. Hopp 39
Terry K. Hugunin 40
James Legare 40
JoAnne Miller 41
Benjamin Tom 41

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala 42
Rev. Amos C. Brown 42
Patrick Fitzgerald 43
Dean Goodman 43
Andre Pehargou 44
Julie Tang 44
Moy Velasquez 45
Dr. Timothy Wolfred 45

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (if applicable)
All Candidates 21

PROPOSITIONS
PROPOSITION A
Would authorize issuance of $42.5 million in
Port revenue bonds.
Analysis 46
Arguments 47-51
Legal Text 51

PROPOSITION B
Would authorize issuance of $104 million in
Water Department revenue bonds.
Analysis 52
Arguments 53
Legal Text 81, 82

PROPOSITION C
Would remove Health Department from CAO
jurisdiction and place it under a commission
appointed by the Mayor.
Analysis 54
Arguments 55-61
Legal Text 82-84

PROPOSITION D
Would change the standards under which the
Retirement System makes investments.
Analysis 62
Argument 63
Legal Text 63

PROPOSITION E
Would extend employee health benefits to sur-
viving spouses.
Analysis 65
Arguments 66, 67
Legal Text 67

PROPOSITION F
Would give additional death benefit to employ-
ees killed on the job.
Analysis 68
Arguments 69
Legal Text 69, 85-89

PROPOSITION G
Would increase the probationary period for
new police officers.
Analysis 70
Arguments 71
Legal Text 89

PROPOSITION H
Would grant motorcycle premium pay to all
two-wheel motorcycle police officers.
Analysis 72
Arguments 73
Legal Text 89-92

PROPOSITION I
Would require CAO to monitor military and
social expenditures by Federal government and
produce annual report.
Analysis 74
Arguments 75
Legal Text 75

PROPOSITION J
Would declare an official policy of not investing
City pension funds in companies doing business
in South Africa.
Analysis 76
Argument 77-80

CREDITS
The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were
prepared by the San Francisco Ballot
Simplification Committee, a non-par-
tisan group appointed by the Mayor
and the Board of Supervisors. The
members of the Committee are Dick
Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette,
Roberta Borganovo, Stephanie Salter
and Susan Kwock. They were assisted
by Thomas Toomey of the City At-
torney's Office.
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the “YES” or after the word “NO”.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.
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INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perforé la balota en el circulo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perforé la balota en el circulo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escribe el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perforé la balota en el circulo que señala la flecha después de la palabra “SI” o después de la palabra “NO”.

Todas las marcas o borradas están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

選民須知:

選民所選擇的任何候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投票之候選人打孔，但不要超過候選人的規定人數。

選民於填寫候選人選票時，請在候選人選票卡所提供之預定空位上寫下該候選人所競選的職位和候選人的姓名。

選民投票時，請在選票上箭頭所指之“YES”或“NO”字樣打孔。

選票上若有顯著污點或揉捲者，選票即作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔誤了，請重新填寫，或撕破了，或撕破了非候選人選票時，應把撕選票遞交給選舉區之監票員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
## President and Vice President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RONALD REAGAN</strong></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEORGE BUSH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SONIA JOHNSON</strong></td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMMA WONG MAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WALTER F. MONDALE</strong></td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GERALDINE A. FERRARO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAVID BERGLAND</strong></td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAMES A. LEWIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOB RICHARDS</strong></td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAUREEN KENNEDY SALAMAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## United States Representative 6th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOUGLAS BINDERUP</strong>, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BARBARA BOXER</strong>, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOWARD CREIGHTON</strong>, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### State Senator
#### 3rd District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILTON MARKS, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS, Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIA BELL, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK PICKENS, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member of the State Assembly
#### 17th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.,</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORATOR, ASAMBLEA DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALEF, ASAMELA DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE TEACHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE S. DOLSON, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAESTRO DE UNIVERSIDAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES

**Member, Board of Supervisors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Service Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Health Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrador de Servicios de Salud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT D. INGRAHAM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultor Político</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR M. DAVIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hi-Tech Business Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mujer de Negocios / Campo Tecnológico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultor Administrativo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE B. KENNEDY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Musician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Musico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney / Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado / Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SALEH ABDULLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Real Estate Salesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendedor de Bienes y Raíces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUZANNE ALBERTO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretaria Administrativa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE RENNE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Scientist / Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Especialista en Ciencias Políticas / Educador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIANNE MALVEAUX</td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics Professor / Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profesor de Economía / Escritor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN L. MOLINARI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
- Vote por no más de 6 de los 29 candidatos.

(Contest Continued on Next Page)
(Continua en la siguiente pagina)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation/Role</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES</td>
<td>Banker/City Clerk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS</td>
<td>Executor/Socialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>RUBY T. JIMENEZ</td>
<td>Directory Sales Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY ANDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>SFCC Student/Student/Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>HARRY BRITT</td>
<td>Member/Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Socialists Union Militant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>RANDALL BRONNER</td>
<td>Artist/Musician/Student/Member/Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>JONATHAN BULKLEY</td>
<td>Architect/Neighborhood Planner/Arquitect/Planificador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>ROGER BOSCHETTI</td>
<td>T.V. Ethnic Producer/Producer/Programs de Televisión</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>KEVIN STARR</td>
<td>Businessman/Communicator/Professor/Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>CAROL RUTH SILVER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/Incumbente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>DAVID C. SMITH</td>
<td>Administrator/Service Agency/Escritor/Movimiento Socialista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>JOHN E. WAHL</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Writer/Movimiento Socialista/Writer/Movimiento Socialista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION</th>
<th>教育委員</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent and Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maestra y Madre de Familia</td>
<td>家長和教師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant</td>
<td>持證公共會計師／財政顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contador Público / Consultor Financiero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultor</td>
<td>顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE S. HOPP</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
<td>現任教育委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICK CERBATOS</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Education</td>
<td>教育委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meembro, Junta de Educacion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor, Muni Railway</td>
<td>市營公共車監督</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor, Tranvías Municipales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
<td>現任教育委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBBY DENEBEIM</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
<td>現任教育委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE DYKSTRA</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services Director</td>
<td>社區服務主任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director de Servicios Comunitarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Truck Operator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductor de Camiones</td>
<td>貨車司機</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST &quot;CHUCK&quot; AYALA</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN GOODMAN</td>
<td>Teacher/Actor, Maestro/Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>County Central Committeeman, Miembro del Comité Central del Condado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE F. PEHARGOU</td>
<td>Civil Servant, Funcionario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>Professor, Profesor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOS C. BROWN</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM WOLFRED</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 25 | **CLEAN WATER BOND LAW OF 1984.** This act provides for a bond issue of $325,000,000 to provide funds for water pollution control, water conservation, and water reclamation projects and activities. | **YES 184**<sup>→</sup>  
**NO 185**<sup>→</sup> |
| 26 | **STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1984.** This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools. | **YES 187**<sup>→</sup>  
**NO 188**<sup>→</sup> |
| 27 | **HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE CLEANUP BOND ACT.** This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for hazardous substance cleanup. | **YES 190**<sup>→</sup>  
**NO 191**<sup>→</sup> |
| 28 | **CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1984.** This act provides for a bond issue of $75,000,000 to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards. | **YES 193**<sup>→</sup>  
**NO 194**<sup>→</sup> |
| 29 | **VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1984.** This act provides for a bond issue of $650,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans. | **YES 196**<sup>→</sup>  
**NO 197**<sup>→</sup> |
| 30 | **SENIOR CENTER BOND ACT OF 1984.** This act provides for a bond issue of $50,000,000 to provide funds for senior centers. | **YES 199**<sup>→</sup>  
**NO 200**<sup>→</sup> |
| 31 | **PROPERTY TAXATION. FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS EXCLUSION.** Empowers Legislature to exclude from property tax reassessment certain newly constructed fire protection improvements. Fiscal Impact: If implemented, estimated local government property tax revenue losses of less than $5 million annually, state government increases in costs to compensate for local school district property tax loss, and state government increases in income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions. | **YES 203**<sup>→</sup>  
**NO 204**<sup>→</sup> |
| 32 | **SUPREME COURT. TRANSFER OF CAUSES. REVIEW OF DECISIONS.** Modifies existing constitutional provisions regarding transfer of causes and review of decisions. Fiscal Impact: No significant effect. | **YES 206**<sup>→</sup>  
**NO 207**<sup>→</sup> |
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MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DO LOS VOTANTES PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

25. LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA LIMPIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $325,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para control de la contaminación del agua, conservación del agua y para proyectos y actividades de recuperación del agua.

26. LEY ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMpra-AÑADIDOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar el desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas.

27. ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA LIMPIEZA DE SUBSTANCIAS PELIGROSAS. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para limpiar del medio las substancias peligrosas.

28. LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA POTABLE SALUDABLE DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $75,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la mejora de los sistemas de agua domésticos para cumplir con las normas mínimas de agua potable.

29. ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $650,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.

30. ACTA DE BONOS PARA CENTROS PARA PERSONAS DE EDAD MAYOR DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $50,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para centros para personas de edad mayor.

31. FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE LOS SISTEMAS DE PROTECCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS. Esta acta establece una fijación de impuestos a la propiedad, excluyendo los sistemas de protección contra incendios. Se prevé que los ingresos se destinen a proteger contra incendios y a fortalecer la seguridad de los habitantes de las áreas urbanas.

32. CORTE SUPREMA. TRANSFERENCIA DE CAUSAS, REVISIÓN DE DECISIONES. Modifica la legislación existente para transferir causas y revisar decisiones de la cortes superiores. Modifica disposiciones constitucionales en vigor en cuanto al traspaso de causas y la revisión de decisiones. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto significativo.
### Property Tax Postponement. Disabled Person.

**Proposition 33**

Authorizes Legislature to postpone property tax payments on owner occupied principal residence by disabled person. Fiscal Impact: State expenditures estimated to be less than $2 million annually which would be recovered, with interest, when the homes are sold.

- **Yes:** 210
- **No:** 211

### Property Taxation. Historic Structure Exclusion.

**Proposition 34**

Excludes from property tax reassessment certain new construction on owner occupied principal residence historic structures. Fiscal Impact: Local governments property tax revenue loss of less than $100,000 annually. State government expenditure of about 32% of this to compensate local school districts for property tax revenue losses.

- **Yes:** 214
- **No:** 215

**Proposition 35** (has been withdrawn from the ballot)

### Taxation.

Amends Proposition 13 adding restrictions on real property taxation, new tax measures, and charging fees. Provides specified tax refunds. Fiscal Impact: State revenues reduced at least $100 million, net, over first two-year period. State costs increased up to $750 million over first two-year period and by about $150 million annually in subsequent years to replace revenue losses to schools. Local agencies other than schools property tax and other revenue losses of about $2.8 billion, net, over first two-year period and of about $1.1 billion annually in subsequent years.

- **Yes:** 223
- **No:** 224

### State Lottery.

Establishes state-operated lottery. Revenue use: prizes, 50%; expenses, not more than 16%; public education, at least 34%. Fiscal Impact: Cannot be predicted with certainty. Estimated yield for public education would be about $500 million annually, with less the first two years. Estimated division: K-12, 80%; Community Colleges, 13%; California State University, 5%; University of California, 2%.

- **Yes:** 228
- **No:** 229

### Voting Materials. English Only.

Requires Governor urge federal officials amend law so that voting materials be printed in English only. Fiscal Impact: Insignificant.

- **Yes:** 232
- **No:** 233
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33

POSTERGACIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD, PERSONAS INHABILITADAS. Autoriza a la Legislatura a posponer los pagos del impuesto a la propiedad sobre una residencia principal ocupada por un dueño que no sea una persona inhabilitada. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales calculados según menos de $32 millones anuales los cuales serían recuperados con intereses, cuando las residencias sean vendidas.

34

FUJIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE ESTRUCTURA HISTÓRICA. Excluye del recaudo del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas construcciones o trabajos nuevos efectuados en residencias que son estructuras históricas ocupadas por sus dueños como el principal lugar de residencia. Impacto fiscal: Gastos gubernamentales estatales alrededor del 32% de esta suma para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida de ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad.

35

La Proposición número 35 no será usada en esta elección.

36

FUJIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. Enmienda la Proposición 13 añadiendo restricciones en la fijación de impuestos a la propiedad inmueble, nuevas medidas de impuestos y honorarios a cobrar. Despeje: Reducción en los ingresos estatales en por lo menos $100 millones durante el primer periodo de dos años. Aumento en los costos estatales de hasta $750 millones durante el primer periodo de dos años y en unos $150 millones anuales en años subsiguientes para reemplazar la pérdida de ingresos para las escuelas. Pérdidas para otras agencias locales, además de las escuelas, del impuesto a la propiedad y otras pérdidas de ingresos de alrededor de $200 mil millones netos, durante el primer periodo de dos años y de alrededor de $1 mil millones anualmente en años subsiguientes.

37

LOTERÍA ESTATAL. Establece una lotería operada por el estado. Uso de los ingresos: premios, el 50%; gastos, no más del 15%; educación pública, por lo menos el 34%. Impacto fiscal: No puede ser predicho con certeza. El rendimiento que se calcula para la educación pública será de alrededor de $500 millones anuales, siendo menor los dos primeros años. División que se calcula: Jardín de infantes al 12º grado, el 80%; universidades de la comunidad el 13%; Universidad Estatal de California el 5%; Universidad de California, el 2%.

38

MATERIAL DE VOTACIÓN. INGLÉS SOLAMENTE. Requiere que el Gobernador urja a los oficiales federales a que enmienden la ley para que los materiales para votación sean impresos en inglés solamente. Impacto fiscal: Insignificante.
### CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, GENERAL ELECTION, NOVEMBER 8, 1994

#### REAPPORTIONMENT

Provides reapportioning Senate, Assembly, Congressional, Equalization districts for 1986 and subsequent elections by new commission composed of former justices. Fiscal Impact: Commission costs of up to $3.5 million before 1986 election. Costs of $10,000 to $20,000 each to relocate an unknown number of district legislative offices. County costs of about $500,000 for 1986 election materials. County savings of about $300,000 in 1986 for printing costs, and $200,000 every two years thereafter. Future reapportionments will probably cost less than under existing law.

**YES 237**

**NO 238**

#### CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Limits contributors and contributions to elective state office candidates. Opposition candidate's personal expenditures matched by limited public funding. Fiscal Impact: Reduce state revenues by about $100,000 each fiscal year and increase state expenditures by approximately up to $1,650,000 each fiscal year.

**YES 242**

**NO 243**

#### PUBLIC AID, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Creates Public Assistance Commission. Limits benefit expenditures to national average plus 10%. Legislative amendments permitted. Fiscal Impact: Net effect would be combined state and county expenditure reduction beginning July 1, 1986. Size of reduction and impact at different levels of government impossible to determine. Substantial reductions under specified programs would be partially offset to an unknown extent by increased costs under other programs and reduced tax revenues resulting from reduced federal expenditures within the state. Likely, state expenditures would be reduced and county expenditures increased.

**YES 247**

**NO 248**

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

**A** Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

**YES 253**

**NO 254**

**B** Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

**YES 256**

**NO 257**

**C** Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

**YES 259**

**NO 260**
REDISTRIBUCIÓN. Dispone redistribución para los distritos del Senado, Asamblea, Congreso y de la Junta de Revisión de Axilón para 1986. El monto y para las elecciones subsequentes mediante nueva comisión compuesta de anteriores jueces. Impacto fiscal: Costos de la comisión de hasta $3.5 millones antes de la elección de 1986. Costos de $10,000 a $20,000 cada uno para recibir un número desconocido de oficinas legislativas en los distintos. Costos del condado alrededor de $500,000 para materiales para la elección de 1986. Ahorros para el condado alrededor de $300,000 en 1986 por costos de impresión y $200,000 cada dos años de sali en adelante. Las redistribuciones futuras probablemente costarán menos que bajo la ley actual.

CONTRIBUCIONES PARA COMPANÍAS. Limita a los contribuyentes y las contribuciones a cargos electivos. Incluye con fondos públicos limitados los gastos personales del candidato de oposición. Impacto fiscal: Reduce los ingresos estatales en unos $100,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal y aumenta los gastos estatales en aproximadamente $1,650,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal.

AUXILIO PÚBLICO, PROGRAMAS DE ASISTENCIA MÉDICA. Crea Comisión de Asistencia Pública. Limita gastos de beneficio al promedio nacional más el 10%. Permite enmiendas legislativas. Impacto fiscal: El efecto neto sería la reducción de los gastos de beneficio de un nivel de $20,000, puede ser reducido en $4,000. Reducciones del gasto de beneficio de $20,000, puede ser reducido en $4,000. Reducciones del gasto de beneficio de $20,000, puede ser reducido en $4,000.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

¿Debería autorizarse a la Comisión del Puerto a emitir $42,500,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la construcción y mejoras de las instalaciones portuarias?

¿Debería autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir $104,000,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones para el Departamento de Aguas?

¿Debería crearse una Comisión de Salud que consista de siete miembros nombrados por el Alcalde para administrar y controlar los hospitales de la Ciudad y el Condado, y los demás servicios de salud del Condado, y para nombrar un Director de Salud Público?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and Black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
<td>Resumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Jubilaciones a hacer inversiones de los fondos de jubilación como persona prudente en lugar de hacer inversiones de carácter legal para compañías de seguros?</td>
<td>應否授權退休委員會作退休基金投資時，可用個人判斷謹慎行事，而不必限於作法律容許保險公司所作的投資?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá la Ciudad subvencionar al cónyuge sobreviviente de empleados activos o retirados de la misma manera que la Ciudad subvención a los empleados activos o retirados en el Sistema de Servicios de la Salud?</td>
<td>市政府給在職身故或退休後去世的僱員的遺偶的保健福勵金，應否與在職或退休僱員的津貼相同?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá pagarse un beneficio de doce meses de salario por falloimiento a diversos oficiales y empleados que mueren como resultado de lesiones físicas externas y violentas durante el transcurso y periodo de empleo?</td>
<td>在工作中或在工作範圍內身體遭受暴力引致的外傷而殉職的各類官員和僱員，應否付給十二個月薪額的死亡撫恤金?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá el periodo probatorio para oficiales de policía extenderse de un año a partir de su entrada a un año después de haber completado el entrenamiento pero sin exceder ochenta y cuatro semanas?</td>
<td>應否延長警員的試用期，即從加入警局起一年延至完成訓練後一年的時間，但不能超過八十四個星期?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá pagarse un salario adicional a los miembros del Departamento de Policía asignados a prestar servicio en todas las motocicletas de dos ruedas?</td>
<td>應否給予警局駕駛兩輪摩托車的警員額外報酬，其數額根據加州有 350,000 人口的城市此種報酬的平均數而定;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>(Ordenanza de Iniciativa): Deberá San Francisco solicitar al Gobierno Federal que pregunte a los contribuyentes de impuestos si desean que una parte de sus impuestos se use para un exceso gasto militar y si desean que la Ciudad publique un informe anual sobre los impuestos federales recaudados en San Francisco y sobre la parte usada para propósitos militares excesivos y la parte usada para necesidades sociales?</td>
<td>（創制法令）: 舊金山應否要求聯邦政府詢求所有納稅人的意見是否願意讓他們的稅款用在過度的軍事費用上，並由市政府每年刊印一份報告，詳列有關聯邦在舊金山所徵稅款，以及用於過度軍事目的和用於社會所需的部分?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>(Declaración de Norma): Deberá ser la norma de San Francisco que ningún fondo de pensión administrado por la Ciudad sea invertido en empresas que tienen intereses comerciales en Sudáfrica hasta que sea abolida la segregación racial y se otorgue a la población de raza negra plenos derechos políticos y civiles en Sudáfrica?</td>
<td>（政策聲明）: 舊金山應否制訂政策，規定市政府管理的退休基金不能投資在與南非有商業關係的商號，直至南非廢除種族隔離，給予黑人充分的政治權利和民權為止?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
If you make a mistake, return your card and get another.

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

USING BOTH HANDS
Insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.
Usando los dos manos, mete la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

A 第一步
请双手持票向自動機将整张選票插入。

STEP 1

STEP 2

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

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

C 第二步
请切記，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 perforre con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
請把選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。　

STEP 4

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

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空白袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 9, 1984.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election, such as this one, you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot.

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

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature, Supervisors, B.A.R.T., College Governing Board and Board of Education.

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

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

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 6, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—you should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 6, 1984.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

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

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

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 25 through 41 because in June the numbers were 16 through 24.

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

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

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

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

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

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
"IT APPEARS TO BE ONE END OF THE NOVEMBER 7 SAN FRANCISCO BALLOT..."

Reprinted by permission of the San Francisco Chronicle.

(Because there are no BART candidates in your district this page would otherwise have been blank.)
JOHN SALEH ABDULLA

My address is 2533 Folsom Street
My occupation is Licensed Real Estate Salesman
My age is 30

My qualifications for office are: I graduated at a local public high school. I also attended private business schools. I am presently a licensed real estate salesman.

Knowing the city's acute housing and employment problems, I am deeply concerned of the these problems and would like to be in a position to find solutions to these problems. While I have no immediate solutions; if elected, I promise the people of San Francisco that I will devote all of my time to finding solutions to these problems by utilizing all resources available to public officials in solving these problems.

John Saleh Abdulla

The sponsors for John Saleh Abdulla are:

Saleh M. Abdulla, 155 Clipper St., Janitor
Sam Bachman, 238 Eddy St., Janitor
Richard F. Bourdon, 165 Clipper St., Mover
Peter Bury, 555 Post St., Musicien
Freddie Cononie, 1419 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Alfred Catalin, 1459 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Bernard Fabro, 3609-18th St., Deputy Clerk
Robert Fulghum, 487 Joost St., Business Representative
Saleh M. Ghanem, 155 Clipper St., Maintenance
Stephen A. Halbe, 1202-23rd Ave., Musician
Jamal Jawad, 488 Ellis St., Business Owner
Zelma Ann Johnston, 575 O'Farrell St., Retired
Barbara D. Jones, 1421 South Van Ness Ave., Housewife
Alfred E. Kelly, 610 Polk St., Retired Union Official
Yhna S. Mohamed, 640 Eddy St., Maintenance
Brian Charles Percy, 333 Hyde St., Payroll clerk
Charles Ridges, 347 Lexington St., Business Representative
Janitors Union
James Roy Sellers, 575 O'Farrell St., Unemployed
Madeline Smith, 159 Clipper St., Housewife
E. Perry Winston, 2806 Harrison St., Architect

SUZANNE ALBERTO

My address is 25 Pinto Avenue
My occupation is Administrative Secretary
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I am a Hispanic-Filipina (English/Spanish-speaking) administrative-secretarial San Francisco worker and Muni commuter and have been a resident voter since 1968.

I believe San Franciscans would be better served if suitable inquiry and evaluation preceded passage of locally needed and desired legislation and tax revenue expenditures to assure anticipated results. San Francisco’s Charter permits supervisory inquiry into expenditures. I strongly support thoroughly researched legislation and tax revenue use to benefit the peoples of San Francisco.

All of my sponsors know me to be a capable, persistent fighter for principles and public benefit and believe I would be an excellent supervisor. Suzanne Alberto

The sponsors for Suzanne Alberto are:

L. J. Alberto, 4156-25th St., Communication Technician
Alvin E. Bernstein, 6 Ranoake St., Computer Analyst
David Carlson Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Tape Librarian
Sarah M. Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Programmer/analyst
Rose Violet Crespin, 241 North Carter Ave., Retired Bookkeeper
Deirdra D. Dunlap, 235 DuMontfort Ave., Telecomm Specialist
R. L. Feather, 111 Inverness St., Secretary
Angel Fernandez, Jr., 1419-11th Ave., Security Officer
David L. Forks, 26 Shields St., Janitor
Paul F. Garin, 238-44th Ave., Security Guard
Joyce A. Glynn, 38 Ferrara Dr., Legal Secretary
Margery M. Gray-Schlink, 255-18th Ave., Financial Administrator
Amy J. Koeber, 206 Fell St., Office Manager
Cheryl Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Housewife
Cheryanne Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Welder
David Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Truck Driver
Ruth Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Housewife
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St., Custodian
Dewey W. McNeil, 251 Topinka Ave., Utility Engineer
Leon Medina, 1725 Church St., Retired-Laborer
Nathan Nemer, 125 Cambon Dr., Retired-Producer Buyer
Patricia J. Powell, 206 Fell St., Publishing
Petty Randall, 366 Wilke St., Grocery Clerk
Roberto Sampere, 328 Staples Ave., St. Drafter
Clifford C. Schlink, 255-18th Ave., Mechanic
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Clerical
E. L. Thompson, 111 Inverness St., Student
Kenneth E. Tucker, Jr., 243 Hahn St., Building and Grounds
Patrolman

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

ROGER BOSCHETTI
My address is 20 Carmelian Way
My occupation is Television Producer, Host, Writer, and Labor Consultant
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of involvement with working men, women, and young people, and as a concerned citizen, I will work to implement laws which will benefit all the people of San Francisco, such as reducing payroll and business tax, so as to encourage small businesses to come or stay in San Francisco, thereby creating more jobs. Will implement constructive changes in muni for speedier, safer and effective service, I will also create better programs to help the needs of our young men and women, I would like more police foot patrol, and more affordable housing, with more concern for our senior citizen

Roger Boschetti

The sponsors for Roger Boschetti are:
William A. Arietta, 16 Wheat St., Police Officer
Rita M. Belli, 1958 Greenwich St., Assessment Clerk
Rachel Boschetti, 20 Carmelian St., Cosmetologist
George Contesti-Turner, 631 O’Farrell St., Instructor/Professor
Bernard M. Cotty, 2971-23rd Ave., City Employee
John E. Downey, 83 Gaviota Way, Nationally Known Referee/Limo Driver/Boxing Judge
Curtis Elliott, 350 Glenvue Dr., Doorman
Evelyn C. Fitzgerald, 230 Stonecrest Dr., School Administrator
Jack Goldberg, 210 Gellert Dr., Labor Consultant
Robert Jacobs, 1438-38th Ave., Business Agent
Roger Micheli, 2655 Chestnut St., Goldengate Disposal
Robert T. Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Lieutenant S.F.P.D. Retired
Shirley Robin Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Investigator
Marie G. Neilsen, 319 Maynard St., Businesswoman
Marie Ann Perri, 80 Malta St., Corporate Secretary
Joseph J. Phillips, 1203 Clayton St., Attorney
John E. Ricci, 1224 Broadway, Lawyer
Don L. Rotan, 134 Gilbert St., Writer
Samuel Smith, 297 Allison St., Seaman Cook
Carmen Solis, 39 Majestic Ave., Restaurant Owner
Rose M. Tarantino, 160 Country Club Dr., Housewife
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
John J. Vidal, Sr., 1437 Judah St., Office Manager
Winston Wong, 225 Anzavista Ave., Manager of American Cab Co.
Herman W. Young, 210 Brookdale Ave., Seaman
Maya Dhillon-Zygaj, 455 Chenery St., Homemaker

RICHARD BRADLEY
My address is 1 Ardath Court
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As a supporter of the Spartacist League I twice tore down the Confederate flag of slavery which flies no more in Civic Center. The American Civil War did not complete its historic mission. It will take a third American revolution, a socialist revolution, to liberate black people.

Spike Reagan's anti-Soviet war plans and union-busting austerity drive by mass strike action! U.S. imperialism—hands off Central America! Smash Klan/Nazi terror through labor/black action! Break with Democrats—enemies of labor/minorities! Build a workers party that will stop at nothing short of socialist revolution and a workers government!

Richard Bradley

The sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 1138 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grubich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikegami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennise Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomesen, 181A Church St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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HARRY BRITT
My address is 783A Guerrero Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: As a full-time Supervisor, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making city government respond to our needs.
• I've supported crime-reducing neighborhood patrols to protect seniors;
• fought to repeal the sewer service charge;
• worked to protect the quality of our neighborhoods and environment;
• secured funding for anti-gay violence programs, AIDS prevention, community arts programs;
• sponsored protections for renters and small businesses from skyrocketing rents;
• worked to create affordable housing;
• sponsored equal pay for comparable jobs;
• worked to have downtown pay its share of taxes;
• worked to save jobs when companies moved from San Francisco.

Harry G. Britt

The sponsors for Harry G. Britt are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Sara Burton, 820 Fillmore St., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman
John L. Molinaro, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister, Community College Board Member
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Member, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Thelma Shelly, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator
Yon Wada, 265-4th Ave., Regent-University of California
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner, Businessman
Carmen Migden, 561-28th St., President, Harvey Milk Club
Sal Roselli, 349 Lexington St., President, Alice B. Toklas Club
Wayne Friday, 1095-14th St., Newspaper Political Editor
Tom Murray, 4715 Balboa St., Newspaper Editor
Thomas F. Waddell, M.D. 141 Albion St., Athletic Games Organizer
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Affordable Housing/Tenant's Rights Worker
Edward L. Peet, 250 Arturoo Dr., Senior Citizen's Advocate
John Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Sierra Club
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus
Leon Bruschke, 557-10th Ave., Firefighter
Howard Gloyd, 553 Noe St., Minister
Andrea Jepson, 1334 Masonic Ave., Nuclear Freeze Leader
Philip E. De Andrade, 601 Mississippi St., Small Business Owner
Georgianna Lynn, 165 El Venn St., West Portal Avenue Business Owner
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon St., Registered Nurse

RANDALL DWAYNE BRONNER
My address is 1390 Market Street
My occupation is artist-musician
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: San Francisco Budget Surplus-$162 Million.
Muni Fare/Fast Pass Revenue-$46 Million.
Aspen, Colorado-Free buses ten years.
Portland-Free buses downtown.

We residents pay for more than two thirds of Muni's cost in our taxes. Residents should ride Muni for free!
You must check out the murals supporting Peace in Central America on Balmy Street.

Please call 864-8641 if you'd like to meet the survivors of 1906, free, at the Great Earthquake Exposition.

If you want to brighten up your street call San Francisco Street Gardeners for free cuttings, succulents, and flowers, at the same number.

Randall Bronner

The sponsors for Randall Bronner are:
Selig R. Raphael, 495-32nd Ave., Survivor 1906 Quake
Jane Dormack, 9 Central Ave., Reporter
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
William T. Witter, 948 Haight St., Artist
James T. Lyon, 1761 Page St., Musician
F. Kelly Hartin, 119 Margaret Ave., Cateress
Julie Tincil, 1653 Washington St., Waitress
Raymundo E. Fena, 1470 Fulton St., Waiter
Mary L. Martinez, 295 Moscow St., Secretary
Sandra Rennel, 601 Post St., Waitress and Prep Work
Giorgio Irving, 1390 Market St., Waiter
Martin James, 1139 Broadway, Bartender
Elizabeth Kelly, 3249 Pierce St., Restaurant Services
Anthony R., Parrinello, 312 Frei Career Ave., Artist
Carlos Gonzalez, 3409-20th St., Community Worker
Robert Burridge, 2584 Folsom St., Carpenter
Susan Cervantes, 398 Frei Career Ave., Artist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
James A. Lewis, 3030 Cabrillo St., Artist/Teacher
Julianne Malveaux, 26 Winfield St., Economist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JONATHAN BULKLEY

My address is 147 Tenth Avenue
My occupation is Architect, Neighborhood Planner
My age is 54

My qualifications for office are: Experienced Architect and Planner. President, Planning Association for the Richmond; Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. Member: Open Space Committee, Mayor's Task Forces for Parking, Mechanical Amusement Devices and Sidewalk Displays.

My Architecture/Planning background will help me respond to the need for a coherent vision of San Francisco as a City that works for everyone.

My priorities include:
- Housing for those most in need—singles, working women, seniors.
- Crime-free streets
- Civil service preference for San Francisco residents.
- Caring solutions to seniors’ needs.
- Eliminating Bay pollution.
- Maintaining Neighborhood Character, Diversity, and Liveability.

The interests of San Francisco Residents will always come first!

Jonathan Bulkley

The sponsors for Jonathan Bulkley are:

Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Tenant Representative, Rent Stabilization Board
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., S.F. Housing Commissioner
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper 1st., Former City Planning Commissioner
Lee Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor; Former Supervisor
Jose Luis Fernandini, 464-43rd Ave., Businessman; Vice President, MAPA
Russell B. Flynn, 2610 Filbert St., President, Rent Stabilization Board
Ann Fagelberg, 2980 Vallejo St., Housewife; Vice Pres., Cow Hollow Association
Terry Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney; Former Supervisor
Lou J. Giaudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Public Utilities Commissioner
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer
Ruth Gravanis, 74 Mipah St., Glen Park Association
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Port Commissioner; Past President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
John Hooper, 201 Buena Vista East, Conservationist; President, Buena Vista Neighborhood Ass’n
Don Horony, 84 Kellogg Ave., Former Supervisor
John H. Kirkwood, 1635 Green St., Member, BART Board
Bill Kuhns, 4215-26th St., Co-Chair, Open Space Committee
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner
Richard Livingston, 380 Eddy St., Administrator, Realty House West; Member, Open Space Committee
Peter McCrea, 1024 Lake St., Businessman; Past Pres., Public Utilities Comm.
Amy Meyer, 3627 Clement St., Rec. & Park Commissioner
William F. O’Keefe, Sr., 444 Corbett Ave., President, S.F. Taxpayers Association
Thomas R. Peretti, 3787-16th St., Banker; President, C.R.I.R.
Alan Ruzick, 237 Topaz Way, Attorney; President, Coalition for S.F. Neighborhoods
Toby Rosenblatt, 3409 Pacific Ave., Businessman; Pres., City Planning Commission
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
Sam Valentino, 500 College Ave., Retired; Past President, Mary’s Park Improvement Club

DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I am a supporter of the Spartacists, the labor/socialists who put a stop to flying the Confederate flag, banner of KKK racism and slavery, in Civic Center. Finish the Civil War! Forward to a workers government!

Without socialist revolution catastrophe threatens mankind. We need an integrated workers party that will take the productive wealth from the capitalist bosses, and establish a workers government and socialist planned economy.

Strike Reagan reaction through mass strikes! Military victory to Salvadoran leftists! Defend the USSR! No support to Democrats—liberal party of imperialism! Smash Taft-Hartley! Labor’s gotta play hardball to win!

Diana Coleman

The sponsors for Diana Coleman are:

Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Richard Bradley, 1 Ardath Ct., Maintenance Building
Dawn D. Cottland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikeyami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennysm Stanfield, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thommen, 1841A Church St., Student

Statement are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ELEANOR M. DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Accounting Services
My qualifications for office are: My experience with community groups and City Hall is extensive.

Involved in local politics through neighborhood and merchant associations, worked on campaigns for Diane Feinstein, and many others. Served the community through the following organizations: Vice President, Clement Merchants, head of legislative committee; Consultant to Polk Merchants; Member, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Roundtable, Vice Chair Health Committee; Board, California Alcohol Treatment Services; Chairperson Alcohol Awareness; Appointee, Mayor’s Task Force on Sidewalk Vending, Parking; San Francisco Outlook, Project Manager; Member, SPUR; Boardmember Public Research Institute, SFSU.

A loyal devotee of San Francisco. I will serve honestly with an open mind and heart.

Eleanor M. Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor M. Davis are:

Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
Robert R. Bacci, 2478-23rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Rachael Balyeat, 2323 Hyde St., Investor
Luis A. Belmonte, 250 Walnut St., Real Estate Developer
Mildred Burrell, 2970 Pine St., General Contractor
Leslie A. Burton, 1528 Baker St., Attorney
Rose Cassano, 863 Carolina St., Artist
Toni Delacorte, 2025 Hayes St., Public Relations Executive
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Deming St., Registered Nurse
John Richard Doyle, 109-12th Ave., Attorney at Law
Adrian Belli Field, 1000 Green St., Housewife
Rory A. Flood, 1070 Revere St., Owner, Fine Furniture Company
Patricia Hooper, 382 Arkansas St., Writer
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman and Library Commissioner
Paul Raynor Keating, 180-4th Ave., Attorney at Law
Dennis E. Kirtley, 1344 Larkin St., Manager of Gift Shop
Beatrice Kushner, 35 Presidio Ter., Attorney at Law
Gordon J. Lau, 340-19th Ave., Attorney
Ted R. Moulton, 1 Leroy Pl., Architect
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Owner, Data Processing Company
Kenneth E. Rowell, 1319-5th Ave., Engineer
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Liquor Store Owner and Chairman of Parking Authority
Robert L. Strauss, 1734-9th Ave., Graduate Student
Debby Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner
Larry Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner

EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES

My address is 695 John Muir Drive
My occupation is Banker
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Forty-four years after my grandparents were married here in San Francisco just seven months after the nineteen hundred and six earthquake. A beautiful blond hair, blue eyed baby boy came bouncing out of St. Joseph’s Hospital. Studying economics at St. Mary’s College after attending Riordan and then leaving religious life to create a conservation newspaper. Trying to educate local residents about the serious problems that we faced here in San Francisco and the bay area. If allowed to fulfill my dreams of what we can accomplish I will gladly give twenty-five per cent of my salary to charity.

Edward Michael Hayes

The sponsors for Edward Michael Hayes are:

Edwin B. Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Miriam Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Agnes Cassady, 385 Day St., Retired
Anna M. d’Otteille, 1356 Dolores St., Housewife
Bertram J. d’Otteille, 1356 Dolores St., Retired
Mary M. Driscoll, 342-28th St., Administrative Assistant
John L. Flynn, 54 Seacliff Terr., Banker
Elaine M. Gillilan, 133 Randall St., Banker
Rae Grubstick, 2474-40th Av., Banker
Marcia Kocel, 44 Mallorea Way, Bank Clerk
Bernece Langley, 460 Duncan St., Retired
Bernadine K. Lough, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William G. Lough, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William D MacGillivray, 2720-35th Ave., Banker
Michael J McCarthy, 3749-22nd St., Retired
Nora S. McManus, 456 Duncan St., Retired
Ellen McSweeney, 457 Duncan St., Retired
Aileen P. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Mary C. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Leona P. Parker, 56 Harper St., Housewife
James L. Phillips, 1407 Church St., Clerk
Janet M. Phillips, 1407 Church St., Secretary
Rita M. Phipps, 230 Prospect Ave., Retired
Eugene F. Sullivan, 456 Duncan St., Ironworker
Catherine C. Tassone, 1795 Sanchez St., Clerk
Nellie Twomey, 1325 Church St., Home-maker
Seymour Whitlaw, 3150 Clay St., Investment Broker
Ann M. Willis, 1356 Dolores St., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT DANIEL INGRAHAM
My address is 1637 Noriega Street
My occupation is Political Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Over one hundred years ago two great men, David Broderick and Edward Baker, gave their lives to save this Republic.

I ask you voters to compare these two San Franciscans with the small minded politicians of today.

Pathetic Wendy Nelder says “Fluoride causes AIDS”; degraded Willie Brown corrupts us with “Oh What a Night” baccalalia; Feinstein lusts for higher office, and the rest are worse.

San Francisco can play an historic role in the development of the Pacific Basin. But you, our citizens, must decide. I urge you: Join with me and other candidates of Lyndon LaRouche’s NDPC in our fight.

Robert Daniel Ingraham

The sponsors for Robert Ingraham are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Garciea Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Phillip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Forklift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elouna Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Maceal M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsber Miller, 52 Balston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1502 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lida G. Portillo, 115 Blanjon Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Solles, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vouritas, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

RUBY T. JIMENEZ
My address is 961 Delano Avenue
My occupation is Directory Sales Representative
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: A San Francisco resident since 1948 and a naturalized American of Mexican descent, I consider myself an earnest interpreter of human needs for the Hispanic community and other minorities. Misinterpretations, injustices, lack of communication and mutual respect must be addressed and aired. These human needs for minorities and others can be solved if we end the current world depression. The humane world economic policies of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly his proposal for joint economic development between the United States and Ibero-America (Operation Juarez) can end this depression. The port of San Francisco should be expanded to become a strong world trade center.

Ruby T. Jimenez

The sponsors for Ruby T. Jimenez are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Garciea Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Stanley J. Bolingi, 1909 Eddy St., Staff Clerk
Willa W. Coleman, 215 Munich St., Sales Representative
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
Patricia L. Hardy, 178 Broad St., Assistant Manager
Patricia Helton, 93 Prentiss St., Teacher, Mission Community College
Andrea Konviser Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ora Lee Jones, 359 Orizaba Ave., Staff Clerk
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Maceal M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
Ruth Matias, 638 Sawyer St., Office Clerk
Patricia McDonagh, 385-28th St., Housewife
Thomas McDonagh, 385-28th St., Construction
Ruth E. Rosenberg, 165 Parnassus Ave., Instructor
Leticia Wickersham, 171 Precita Ave.
Lupe D. Zamudio, 274 Broad St., Sales Representative

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ANDREW ("DADDY ANDY") JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Criminology Student
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I have been a respected citizen and server of San Francisco for 25 years. I’m involved in many community organizations that care for our community such as Glide church, Red Cross volunteers and the Singel parents resource center. I’ve been appointed to sit on the board of such organizations as “Mission Coalition, Mission Model Neighborhood and the Mission Education program,” (appointed by Major Alioto and Mayor Moscone). I’d like to dedicate my Supervior campaign to a few of the many people who helped me over the years, Chef Roy Hammerich, Betty Romenoff and the Mission Childcare Consortium.

Andrew Daddy Andy Jones

WILLIE B. KENNEDY

My address is 950 Duncan Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: In my three years as Supervisor, I have worked to maintain and improve the unique quality of life we have in San Francisco—from rent control to fighting for parks and open spaces. I honor our rich diversity of cultures and life styles through support of neighborhood preservation and the rights of all groups—from children to seniors.

I initiated a campaign to control the tragic increase in child abuse; and am working hard on the problem of decreased employment, particularly for youth.

I want to continue serving your interests in making this the most liveable city in the United States.

Willie B. Kennedy

The sponsors for Willie B. Kennedy are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Elected Official, Speaker of the Assembly
Sale Burton, 920 Shotwell Blvd., Member of Congress
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 400-20th St., Member Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor/Airport Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney At Law
Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Agrippino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman St., Member, Board of Education
Handy Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant, Commissioner PUC
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Union Official
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Aldo P. Lers, 1177 California St., Electrical Contractor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nob Hill St., Philanthropist
Bill Mahler, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
James McCray, Jr., 164-6th Ave., Minister
Sunday Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
Adolph Schuman, 1170 Sacramento St., Businessman
Stun Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Yorl Wada, 365-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Nancy G. Walker, 553 Green St., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilirttas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 121 Golden Gate Avenue
My occupation is Musician
My qualifications for office are: I am one of many in unity with San Francisco's diversity. I "Keyes" will open doors for you, to: homes, jobs, health care, better schools, provide more: complimentary fine arts, concerts, veterans benefits, senior services; close doors on pornography, drugs and prostitution; clean our streets and make them safe once more; eliminate wasteful spending and lower your taxes. For reasons like these, I am your "Keyes". Never again will any San Francisco go wanting, while "special interest" lick their fingers. Let us shine bright, the city that knows how, a guiding light to world peace now.

God help us.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys are:

Gary Gene Adams, 139-5th Ave., Plastic Fabricator
Wayne Austin, 391 Leavenworth St., Job Developer
Brian Chew, 334-30th Ave., Restaurant Worker
Ginger Coyote Coleman, 734 Bush St., Editor of Punk Globe
Hugh T. Dauley, 1177 California St., Computer Operator
Thomas A. Finney, 165 Turk St., Disabled/SSI
Howard M. Grayson, 130 Eddy St., Community Coordinator, Hosp. House
Louis J. Gwerder, 427 Valley St., Laborer
Mickey C. Helmer, 777 Tashma St., Patriot
John R. Hess, 554 Broadway St., Doorman
Kevin M. Kennedy, 250 McAllister St., Social Worker
Patricia E. Kerman, 1026 Montgomery St., Film Maker
John Lyman, 149-6th St., Musician
Patrick Marsh, 251-27th St., Chef
Perry V. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Teacher
Michelle Miller, 15 Surrey St., Student
David M. Moels, 350 Frederick, Sympathic Musician
Keith F. Moog, 1233 Guerero St., Controller
Gary Posner, 443 Broadway St., Engineer
Steven Present, 373 Ellis St., Security Officer
Clark Sullivan, 765 Ellis St., Political Activist
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Office/Clerical
Robin Vega, 1330 Jessie St., Courier
H. Joseph Wagner, 121 Golden Gate Ave., Musician
James E. Washington, Jr. 25 Mason St., Consultant, Arts and Science
Guy West, 640 Polk St., Broadcasting
Linda Marie White, 777 Tehama St., Seamstress

DAVID L. KILBER

My address is 1901 Noriega Street
My occupation is Management Consultant
My age is 40
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of Oregon State University, a Vietnam Veteran, and a former candidate for California State Assembly. I have resided in the Sunset district with my wife Susan for five years.

I stand for a strong defense policy including the Beam Weapon anti-missile defense and the technology boom this new "Apollo" program will bring to the local economy.

San Francisco must become a center for science, classical culture, and trade, bringing blue-collar families and industry back to this city. We must expand the Port of San Francisco and launch the Pacific Basin development strategy proposed by economist Lyndon LaRouche.

David L. Kilber

The sponsors for David L. Kilber are:

Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraitao, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 447 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elonora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Balston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lida G. Portillo, 115 Blankey Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soeules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninicek, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaits, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
Edith Wasserkug, 2670-40th Ave., Retired
J. G. Wasserkug, 2670-40th Ave., Retailer

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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QUENTIN L. KOPP

My address is 68 Country Club Drive
My occupation is Attorney/Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Local government is us, because we depend upon it to provide essential services and wise leadership. For 13 years I've fought to cut governmental waste and excessive taxation, to keep government honest and on its toes. My efforts have already saved taxpayers over $250,000,000 and I'm proud to be the one supervisor who watches how every dollar is spent. This year City government will spend an average $4,500,000 a day, every day. I want to continue my role as your "financial watchdog" in City Hall and add needed balance to the Board. I would very much appreciate your support.

Quentin L. Kopp

The sponsors for Quentin L. Kopp are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Former Mayor
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Former Member of the Board of Supervisors
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Attorney at Law
Sara Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Margaret Cruz, 228 Monterey Blvd., Businessperson
Robert C. Elkus, 469 Magellan Ave., Attorney at Law
George Evankovich, 1600-A Greenwich St., Labor Representative
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Jack E. Frankel, 72-22nd Ave., Rabbi
Merla Zellerbach Goerner, 225 Presidio Ter., Author/Journalist
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Attorney at Law
Carleton Goodlett, 2060 O'Farrell St., Publisher
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author/Retired Publisher
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Golda Kaufman, 200 Pacific Ave., Homemaker/Domestics
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070-26th Ave., Congressional Assistant
Joseph P. Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
John Lo Schiavo, 2130 Fulton St., Priest/Educator
Haig G. Mardikian, 2980 Divisadero St., Businessman
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired President of City Employees
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Harriet C. Sarno, 55 Crestlake Dr., Self Employed
Businesswoman
Burk A. Toler, 581 Ortega Ave., Educator/Police Commissioner
Dorothy Viskich, 177 San Aleso Ave., Housewife/Volunteer
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arbalo Drive
My occupation is Political Scientist/Educator
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: impressive. A full decade of political activism at national, state, and local levels. Leadership roles in labor, housing, and education. To illustrate my seriousness in leading our City, I have launched the following initiative campaigns:
* A 3-year rent freeze
* Commercial rent control
* A balanced budget
* Expedition of labor disputes
* Driver-ownership of taxicabs
* An outdoor stadium in front of Moscone Center
As your supervisor, I will pursue:
* District elections for district councils
* Metro services for the Richmond, Marina, Bayview
* Higher police standards
* More schools and parks
You need me now, San Francisco! Who else you gonna call?

Julian O. Lagos

The sponsors for Julian Lagos are:
Charles Martin Adams, 54 4th St., Cab Driver
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 577 Arbalo Dr., Psychologist
Elizabeth Alvarez, 1262 La Playa St., Sales
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall St., Computer Consultant
Elizabeth Benford, 508 Andover St., Attorney
Katherine Bobrowsky, 417 Stockton St., Unemployed
Thomas J. Callan, 17 Sutro Heights Blvd, Consultant
James D. Cantor, 742 Treat Ave., Station Attendant
Henry Conserva, 1258 40th Ave., Professor
Leon Datangel, 725 Van Ness Ave., Businessman
Peggy L. Dickson, 320 Monticello, Student
Mark Emery, 555 Taylor St., Artist
James Michael Faye, 1369-B Page St., Tenant Advocate
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore St., Videographer
Ken Johnson, 42 Kelloch St., Cabdriver
Vincent B. Latimer, 4118-A 24th St., Service Manager
Richmond Loewinson, 1341 Valencia St., Writer
John B. Loret, 905 Columbus Ave., Cab Driver/Fisherman
Bernice Martin, 506 Church St., Public Stenographer
Jonathan Mc Curdy, 80 Alvarado St., Attorney
Victor E. Miller, 1341 Valencia St., Editor
Steven A. Schectman, 1301 20th St., Attorney
William F. Taylor, 1890 Clay St., Operating Engineer
Frank S. Warner, 2530 Fillmore St., Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 249 Cotter St., Legal Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JULIANNE MALVEAUX
My address is 26 Winfield Street
My occupation is Economics Professor/Labor Specialist/Writer
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscoan and former White House staffer (1977-78) Dr. Julianne Malveaux (pronounced “Mal-Voh”) is an elected California State Central Committee woman who is committed to a diverse San Francisco:
—San Francisco Tomorrow Board Member
—Booker T. Washington/Ella Hill Hutch Board Member
—Strong Supporter: Mondale-Ferraro
—Steering Committee, San Francisco Plan Initiative
—Delegate candidate for Jesse Jackson
—Former staff, President’s Council of Economic Advisers
—Ph.D. (Economics, MIT)
—Co-author of three books
—Columnist, San Francisco Sun Reporter
—Priority focus: job creation programs for youth, minorities, and women
—Author, 1984 Ballot Proposition J which prohibits San Francisco pension fund investments in South Africa.

The sponsors for Julianne Malveaux are:
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folson St., Student
Judith Brecka, 609 Kansas St., Lawyer, City Commissioner
Randall Bronner, 1390 Market St., Artist/Musician
Rene Cazenave, 2852-22nd St., Housing Advocacy
Terence Faulkner, 2571 42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Thomas C. Fleming, 2171 O’Farrell St., Journalist
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Margaret A. Gammon, 3649-18th St., Attorney
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Yvonne S. Golden, 1743-9th Ave., School Administrator
Peter M. Good, 709 Shafter St., Arborist
Roberto Y. Hernandez, 852 Moultrie St., Director, Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer
Doris W. Kahn, 3259 Clay St., Transportation Commissioner
Tony Kifroy, 473-11th Ave., President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Michael Koblenz, 825 Masonic Ave., Distributor
Orella Langston, 55 Friendship Way, Senior and Geriatric Specialist
Arthur Lathan, 2530-48th Ave., Personnel Administrator
Michael C. Miller, 1920 Quint St., Attorney
Jack D. Morrison, 44 Woodland Ave., Management consultant
Carl Diacle Reese, 2034-46th Ave., Graduate Student
Ruth Gordon Schnapp, 726-23rd Ave., Structural Engineer
Frances M. Shashak, 259-32nd Ave., Consumer Rights Advocate
Anita Silvers, 15 Otsego St., Professor, S.F. State
Arlo Smith, 66 Fernando Way, District Attorney
Bruce M. StCy, 343 Chester Ave., Vice President AFSCME Local 2620
Ida V. Strieklund, 1664 Fulton St., Administrator
Calvin Welch, 519 Ashbury St., Community Consultant

JOHN L. MOLINARI
My address is 30 16th Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: To make San Francisco work takes both good ideas and cooperation with everyone.
For over 12 years as your Supervisor, my contribution has been to bring together both the diverse viewpoints of San Francisco’s many communities and the other Supervisors to solve our City’s problems. With your support, I’ve:
—Promoted the construction of more housing; limited condominium conversions to protect renters; protected tenants from rent gougers and outrageous security deposits;
—Initiated escort services to protect seniors;
—Initiated preferential parking and parking ticket amnesty programs;
—Protected our neighborhood character from big companies forcing out small merchants; and
—Protected San Francisco’s parks and playgrounds.

The sponsors for John L. Molinari are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
John Francis Foran, 900 Rockdale Dr., State Senator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembleman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Nancy C. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Louise K. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Homemaker/Media Producer
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Member, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Pastor
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddox Ave., Director, Patient Advocacy
Gordon J. Lau, 540 19th Ave., Member, Port Commission
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Duke J. Armstrong, 352 Diviadero St., Former President, C.R.I.R.
Paul Boneberg, 647-A Castro St., President, Stonewall Gay Political Club
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, Community United Against Violence
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter (B.A.R.)
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Member, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Political Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington Way, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Political Club
Maureen J. Conroy, 650 Eucalyptus Dr., Homemaker
John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Chair, Sierra Club Bay Chapter
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus
Michael S. Salarino, 9 Crestlak Dr., Sunset District Merchant

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Senior Health Care Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I am a political progressive with extensive professional experience as an administrator, program consultant, mediator, and service provider. These skills and my perspective will be valuable additions to the Board.

My commitment to economic and social justice is backed by 25 years of community service to ethnic and cultural minorities, women, low- and moderate-income families, elders, youths, gay people, small businesses, workers, the disabled, and government policy-makers.

I support neighborhood preservation, affordable housing measures (including rent control), jobs and job training for San Franciscans, comparable worth, and environmental safeguards.

I am a parent and San Francisco homeowner.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

- Priscilla Alexander, 745 Haight St., Feminist Activist
- Zohn F. Artman, 141 Albion St., Media Consultant
- Michael Bernick, 378 Golden Gate Ave., Executive Director, SF Renaissance
- Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
- Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing Manager
- Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, CUNY
- Dennis M. Collins, 145-27th St., Political Consultant
- Greg Day, 2260 Market St., Youth Services Director
- Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Attorney/Teacher
- Walter R. Ems, 188 Eureka St., Retired
- Lawrence V. Eppinette, 765 Geneve Ave., Confidential Secretary
- Roma Guy, 383 Missouri St., Co-Director, The Women's Foundation
- Kenneth W. Jones, 600 Fillmore St., Office Manager; SF AIDS Foundation
- Linda Jupiter, 2768-22nd St., Book Production Manager
- Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Senior Services Administration
- Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
- Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
- Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
- Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired Police Commissioner
- Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant, S.F. Sheriff's Department
- Juanita Owens, 371 Coleridge St., Educator/Administrator
- Tah A. Pearlman, 464 Duboce Ave., Writer/Photographer
- Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Political Activist
- Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Union Business Representative
- Margaret Rubenstein, 46 Stillings Ave., Therapist
- Stephen H. Walters, 1223 Diamond St., Fundraiser

JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS

My address is 1203 Clayton Street
My occupation is Executive (Probate Attorney)
My qualifications for office are: This is not New York. My grandfather worked for this city for thirty-six years; helping to make San Francisco the greatest place on earth in which to live. Now our city bus system has to go hat in hand to Los Angeles to borrow buses. The quality of care at our general hospital has come under extreme question. The city of love, tolerance, and understanding is becoming more and more divided by every hate on earth. I, as a fourth generation San Franciscan, call upon you to join us natives in the fight to keep San Francisco San Francisco.

Joseph James Phillips

The Sponsors for Joseph J. Phillips are:

- Margaret Moskovitz Berzin, 2201 Lake St.,Retired
- Ernest Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
- Amelia Sheehan, 436-27th Ave., Homemaker
- Salvador Garza, 795 Brunswick St., Businessman
- Gerald E. Gallagher, 2252-34th Ave., Retired
- Jean M. McDermott, 325-9th Ave., Tax Preparer
- A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
- Juanita G Cardinell, 1215-18th St., Retired
- Peter G. Economou, 2040 Alemany Blvd., Retired
- Laura Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Volunteer for Handicapped
- Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
- Consuelo G. MacDonald, 801-44th Ave., Retired
- Roger Boschetti, 20 Carmelian St., Television Producer
- Jody S. Hirota, 571-19th Ave., Dental Hygienist
- Maurice C. Bihan, 111 Willard North St., Salesman
- Kelly Lyon, 435-25th Ave., Secretary
- Ralph A. Baris, 1236 Athens St., Retired Teamster
- Laura B. Campbell, 1275-32nd Ave., NOW
- William E. Bayers, Jr., 3232 Geary Blvd, Printer
- Pearle Wong, 1555 Shafter St., Housewife
- Sophia E. Conley, 2845 Cubrillo St., Teacher
- Jimmy Starr, 23 Boardman Pl., Lawyer
- Hannah Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
- John L. Santiago, 150 Woodland Ave., Retired
- Walter J. Murphy, 767 Coral St., Retired
- Carl H. Hoppe, 100 Hamilton St., Retired
- Jack I Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
- Sam Kelstein, 84 Lopez Ave., Self Employed
- Helen Marie Sheehan, 875-30th Ave., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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LOUISE RENNE

My address is 3725 Jackson Street
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: As Finance Committee chairperson I have protected vital services while cutting wasteful expenditures. Sound policies have been implemented. San Francisco is on solid financial footing.
At the same time I played a leadership role in legislation affecting the environment, health care, Muni, the arts, indeed all San Franciscans (including our seniors and children).
My prior experience includes Deputy Attorney General, Criminal and Environmental Units; argued cases in Supreme Court; President, California Women Lawyers.
As an effective Supervisor, I pledge to continue my hard work, to act responsibly and compassionately, and to speak honestly on the critical issues affecting all San Franciscans.

Louise Renne

The sponsors for Louise Renne are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman 16th District
Bernard Averbuch, 33 Rivoli St., Public Relations
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director—CYO—Urban Development
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Pres. Airport Commission
Susan J. Biemont, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Harry G. Britt, 783A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Sal Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Thomas J. Cuhlil, 246-17th Ave., Chief of Police, Retired
Lily Cuneo, 3819 Jackson St., Housewife
Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Anne W. Habedt, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President, Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Vice President, ILOTU
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polk St., Businessman/Commissioner
John S. Jennings, 2743 San Bruno Ave., Realtor (Ret.)
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director of ILWU
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
Leslie M. Lawrence, 2423 Broadway, Certified Public Accountant
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner and Attorney
Melvin D. Lee, 450-22nd Ave., Engineer (Commissioner, S.F. Redevelopment Agency)
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Cyril Magnin, One Nob Hill Cir., Philanthropist
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor, State of California
Louise Ogden, 1674 Fillbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Business Representative
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Investment Advisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, SF Board of Supervisors
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CAROL RUTH SILVER

My address is 68 Ramona Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: Experience: Seven years a San Francisco Supervisor; twenty years a practicing attorney; mother of two.
—Responsiveness to neighborhoods:
—My parking reform legislation will open up neighborhood parking spaces.
—My fire and smoke detector legislation will make our whole City more safe.
—Advocate for fairness legislation:
—preserving sunlight in parks
—outlawing gay discrimination
—creating low and moderate income housing
—repairing City streets and buildings
—rent control
—protecting Chinatown merchants
—S.A.F.E. and Senior Escort Programs
—Neighborhood Arts Programs
—reducing smog
—preserving San Francisco Bay
—expanding Muni
—wheelchair accessibility
—more women and minorities receiving City contracts
—child care
I will continue to insist on fairness.

Carol Ruth Silver

The Sponsors for Carol Ruth Silver are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist
Sal Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Jeff Brown, 830-40th Ave., Public Defender
George Agnost, 2131 Funston Ave., City Attorney
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., San Francisco Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 69 Ellis St., San Francisco Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, 335 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., San Francisco Supervisor
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, President, Airport Commission
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Utilities Commissioner
Emmett D. Condon, 2500-21st Ave.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Tim N. Dayonot, 645 Randolph St., Charity Media Specialist
Teressa E. Griffin, 839-41st Ave., Retired Teacher
Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired
Samuel Jordan, 4006-3rd St., Caterer
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Civil Engineer
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Education
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Realitor
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Business Representative
Jack Trujillo, 74 Ramirez St., Word Processor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DAVID C. SMITH
My address is 2567 Alemany Blvd
My occupation is Administrator, Service Agency
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: I am a San Francisco State graduate in journalism, married, with a deep affection for this place. For seven years my wife and I have counseled families and individuals from every neighborhood in San Francisco—an investment and commitment to the future. Dealing with these problems has increased my awareness of this city's growing preoccupation with rights and shrinking concern for responsibilities. The solution includes a return to basics, to strong family units, to solid values, to the worth of all human life. I will be a voice for those who feel excluded, especially exploited children and the disadvantaged.

David C. Smith

KEVIN STARR
My address is 445 Chestnut Street
My occupation is Businessman, Communicator, Professor
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Born in San Francisco, I relish the past, present and future of this great city. I know it from a variety of perspectives—as executive aide to Mayor Alioto, as City Librarian, as a newspaper columnist, as a professor, as a businessman, and as a person active in many civic causes. I now wish to bring my talents and experience to the Board of Supervisors. I believe I can be of unique service as the centrist advocate of this city as it looks to its future. That future, the well-being of each of us, will be my greatest concern.

Kevin Starr

The sponsors for David C. Smith are:
James Bailey, Sr., 422 Guerrero St., Minister
Lillian P. Bailey, 422 Guerrero St., Housewife
Janis Ann Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Secretary
Jeffrey Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Photographer
Robert R. Carlson, 337 Baden St., Radio Producer
Victoria A. Carlyle, 1808 Octavia St., Political Analyst
John William Castro, 3 Plymouth St., Mover
John Frederick Decker, 1090 Eddy St., Designer
Frances Edwards, 2554 Alemany Blvd., Housewife
Daisy Hepburn, 20 Tapa Dr., Homemaker
David Hepburn, 20 Tapa Dr., High School President
James W. Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Police Officer
Jean Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Housewife
James L. Higgs, 270 Juanita Way, Pastor
Margaret M. Lee, 730-12th Ave., Secretary
Mark W. Lee, 881 Silver Ave., President, Simpson College
Arvid Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Norma Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Secretary
Philip Litton, 3340 San Bruno Ave., Student
John A. McGehee, 1230 LaPlaya St., Military, U.S. Army
Charles A. McIlhenny, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
J. Thad McKinney, 766 Kansas St., Station Manager
Marilyn G. Miller, 518 Dewey Blvd., Secretary
Chris Montgomery, 518 Dewey Blvd., Church Worker
Lawrence W. Pong, 254 Arch St., Environmental Health Inspector
James Douglas Robinson, 1319-7th Ave., Moving Company Manager
James W. Robinson, 518 Dewey Blvd., Executive Director of a Christian Service Organization
Conrad R. Sanchez, 1808 Octavia St., Restaurateur
Constance B. Steinbach, 180 Lippard Ave., Homemaker

The sponsors for Kevin Starr are:
Richard B. Allen, 2111 Franklin St., Merchant
Lynn A. Alsthuler, 1490 Sacramento St., Attorney
Thomas E. Anderson, 236 Moncada Way, Clergyman
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Job Training Director
Gino Biradelli, 700 Columbus Ave., Restaurant
Sam Camhi, 265 San Anselmo Ave., Insurance Estate Planner
Frank J. Caufield, 1034 Chestnut St., Venture Capital Investor
Vyoot L. Chu, 1282 Vallejo St., Asian Art Commissioner
Elizabeth A. Cooley, 2820 Scott St., Legal Assistant
Paul Denning, 2165 California St., Investment Banker
Martin Eng, 665 Pine St., County Central Committee Member
James W. Haas, 163 Prospect Ave., Attorney
Patrick E. Hallinan, 117-27th Ave., Attorney
Walter E. Hoadley, 999 Green St., Economist
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Allan S. Johnson, 163 Prospect Ave., Consultant
Dorwin Buck Jones, 245 Northpoint St., Gerontology; Director, Meals on Wheels
Harold K. Lipset, 2509 Pacific Ave., Private Investigator
Frances A. Lopez, 1474 Sacramento St., Paralegal
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Editor
John Maher, 795-8th Ave., Executive
 Roxanne Mankin, 2312 Pacific Ave., Investment Real Estate
Michael Marston, 3375 Jackson St., Real Estate and Development Consultant
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave., Asst. Business Manager, Local 38
John N. Rosekrans, Jr, 2840 Broadway , Businessman, Toy Manufacturer
Michael S. Salarino, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Businessman
Michael Strunk, 2266 Bay St., Construction Executive
Brooks Walker, Jr., 2930 Broadway, Business Executive
Suzan Yee, 632-6th Ave., Attorney

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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**JOHN E. WAHL**

My address is 118C Connecticut Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50

**My qualifications for office are:** I have a 20 year record of voluntary, unpaid public service to San Francisco. I have worked with all levels of City government, with people in all parts of the City. Examples of my public service include being a Judge Pro Tem of the San Francisco Municipal Court, 9 years of service on the Board of the San Francisco Council of Churches, service on the Pride Foundation Board, and service to veterans.

I am dedicated to ensuring affordable places to live, a responsible and unprejudiced police department, decent jobs, and dependable transportation.

I am independent of special interest club politics.

*John E. Wahl*

**SYLVIA WEINSTEIN**

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is Staff-writer for *Socialist Action* newspaper
My age is 58

**My qualifications for office are:** My program:

Courts, cops and strikebreaking injunctions; two-gate, two-tiered, union-busting tactics, are helping employers depress living standards. Escalating health, housing and food costs are forcing working people—especially Blacks and Latinos—out of San Francisco. Corporate condos and high rises replace workers' residences.

Door-key children of working parents, denied childcare, are left to roam the streets. Abortion clinics are under siege.

Only united labor—employed, unemployed, black, white—can change this condition. An independent labor party, based on the unions, must be built to replace the callous politicians of the two ruling capitalist parties.

*Jobs not war!*

*Sylvia Weinstein*

**The sponsors for John F. Wahl are:**

Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, Community College Board
Caroline W. Marks, 55 Jordan Ave., Economist and Civic Leader
James T. Sandman, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
E. Patricia (Pat) Lucey, 69 Huntington Dr., Attorney
Benjamin L. Marcus, 84 Winfield St., Rabbi and Chaplain
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Walter W. Grumm, 3126-22nd St., Clergyman
Ann Marie Day, 136 Delmar St., Retired Social Worker
Cleve Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Aide
Paul S. Yeh, 342-8th Ave., Real Estate Agent
Hank Wilson, 1651 Market St., Hotel Operator
Fred L. Kurlander, 115 San Aleso, Attorney
Jean Wall Burgess, 421 Moraga Ave., Lawyer
Gary E. Myerscough, 156 Sprout Ln., Education Administrator
Paula F. Lichtenberg, 925 Jones St., Paralegal
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author, Retired Publisher
Jerry G. Guerra, 85 Fortuna St., Retailer
Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr., M.D., 2170 Hayes St., Physician
Foster W. Weeks, 1910 Greenwich St., Advertising Consultant
Shirley Kaiser, 805-33rd Ave., Teacher
Robert W. Shore, 146 Guerrero St., Businessman
Rosa M. Kwong, 112 Van Ness Ave., Law Student
Charlene Yamato, 416 Font Blvd., Secretary
Jeanette Sibley, 75 Woodhaven Ct., Classroom Teacher
Alan Thompson Smith, 190 Palo Alto Ave., Small Business Owner
Larry E. Hughes, 87 Fortuna St., Paralegal/Consultant
Julita V. DeChavez, 1591-45th Ave., Deputy County Clerk

**The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:**

Alan A Benjamin, 2783-20th St., Editor, *Socialist Action*
Paul Colvin, 558-36th Ave., Printer
Nancy G. Einoe, 615 Central Ave., Teacher
Ralph P. Forsyth, 77 Cedro St., Teacher
May May Gong, 25 Bessie St., Power Plant Operator
Nancy L. Gruber, 921 Alvarado St., Editor
Millie B. Gonzalez, 2543-32nd Ave., Student
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Longshoreman
Ruth Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Office Worker
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297-18th St., Retail Clerk
William G. Leumer, 535 Day St., Mechanic
Ann Mendashe, 2149-48th Ave., Feminist Attorney
Linda L. Ray, 3740-25th St., Registered Nurse
Anna A. Robertson, 535 Day St., Professor
Joseph M. Ryan, 25 Bessie St., Machinist
Karen A. Schieve, 3575-19th St., Sales Clerk
Michael William Schreiber, 3593 Mission St., Muni Driver
Carole Seligman, 245 Whitney St., Muni Bus Driver
Kathryn Setian, 1364-16th Ave., Engineer
Margery Jean VanDerslice, 1540-20th St., Registered Nurse
Christine Vaughn, 1255 Polk St., Poster or Clerk
David Walters, 2543-32nd Ave., Power Plant Operator
Bonnie Weinstein, 1716 Revere Ave., Student
Deborah Weinstein, 1830 Church St., Unemployed Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 489-27th St., Painter

*Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.*
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DAVE WHARTON

My address is 5031 Diamond Heights Blvd.
My occupation is Community Service Attorney
My age is 44

It's time for housing expansion, for transit, traffic, parking overhaul. Time for better City services, especially for seniors and youth. Time to strengthen economy, create jobs, control taxes. Time for neighborhood revitalization, parking relief. Time for human rights advancement, efficient and humane police services. Experiment with Board meetings in neighborhoods.

It's time for goals, results, citizen participation. San Francisco is world class city, small town; lose either, be neither. I build bridges, not barriers. Join our common sense coalition.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:

Michael Hennessy, 201 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Libby Denkem, 200 St Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Douglas Chan, 506 Spruce St., Attorney/Rent Board Commissioner
Jeffery E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Russell Flynn, 2145 Pacific Ave., Real Estate/Rent Board Commissioner
Charles B. Renfrew, 791-14th Ave., Attorney/Former Federal Judge
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Hotel/Real Estate Executive
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Alicea Wang, 1418 Leavenworth St., Educational Specialist
Mortimer Fleishhacker, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Investor
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
Diane C. Kefauver, 1726 Great Highway, Consultant
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Union President/Retired
Jose Gomez, 59 Grandview Ave., Legal Services/Executive Director
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-28th Ave., Teacher
John L. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Insurance/Savings and Loan Chairman
Phyllis Kern, 360 Arbor St., Labor Union Secretary
Russell L. Kauffman, 2654 Bush St., Businessman
Laura E. McBruey, 925 Cole St., Typographer
George M. Ray, 90 Verna Ct., City Employee
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Development Executive
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Agent
Lawrence A. Wilson, 333-A Pierce St., Attorney—Community Volunteer
Deborah R. Pines, 4248-20th St., Financial Consultant
John T. McAlister, Jr, 999 Green St., Businessman
Bobbie Griffith, 50 Lefrand Ave., District Attorney Investigator
Judith Wellin, 165-A Alpine Ter., Teacher

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DICK CERBATOS

My address is 471 Hoffman Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have always been deeply interested in the education of youth. Before my appointment to the Board of Education two years ago, I served twenty years on Citizens' Advisory and PTA committees focussing on education. As an engineer business-owner, I also bring professional skills to the Board.
As a first generation American, I am sympathetic to minority children's problems, and aware that public education is the golden gateway to opportunity and success. I intend to continue pressing for higher test scores, improved discipline and morale, less truancy, and an increase in college admissions.
I am committed to excellence in education.
A. Richard Cerbatos

The sponsors for Dick Cerbatos are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2009 Lyon St., Mayor
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 130 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-30th St., Member, Community College Board
A. Marquez Bautista, 1555 Powell St., Lawyer
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Art Borvicia, 234 Gates St., Attorney at Law
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Diana Christensen, 56 Sancher St., Executive Director
Judy Dillamonic, 3333 Taraval St., President, San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
Jess T. Estiva, 3259 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President-Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Eugene S. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Physician
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Ralph E. Hurtado, 65 Newburg St., Executive Director
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Labor-Union President, ILGWU
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir. ILWU
Myra G. Kopf, 1945-10th Ave., School Board Member
Betty Wallace Lands, 446 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Bill Maher, 69 Esie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Mosecone, 45 St. Francis Cir., Homemaker
Wendy Nelder, 150 Cavanaugh Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Yuri Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.S. Regent
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, S.F. Board of Supervisors
A. Ceci Williams, 60 Hilaritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1220 Ellis St., Economist

CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON

My address is 29 Oliver Street
My occupation is Transit Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I was born and raised in San Francisco, graduating from Balboa High.
For the past 7 years I have been active in the school district having been elected to 2 terms on the District Advisory Committee, 4 years as the chairperson of the Pelton Academic Middle School Parent's Group, and 5 years on the site advisory council at Pelton.
I am married and have 2 children attending Commodore Sloat Elementary School.
I believe there is much work needed to provide the quality education our children need to prepare them for a highly technical society of computers and robotics.
Chris Christenson

The sponsors for Christopher Christenson are:
Essie L. Webb, 186 Maddux Ave., Intake & Referral Specialist
Raymond Tunstall, 515 John Muir Dr., Deputy Sheriff
Francis Smyth, 1700-16th Ave., Deputy Sheriff
Harry E. Jensen, III, 74 Delmonte St., Electrical Transit Manager
Joe W. Turner, 1274 Palomares Ave., Janitor Supervisor II
Martin Larkin, 4733 Lincoln Way, Paint Supervisor
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Supervisor II
Joseph Della Rosa, 50 Oliver St., Seaman
Precious Moore, 2046 Thomas Ave., Home Health Aide
Lisa Sand Dune Katrina, 524 Clipper St., Clerk Typist
William Satchell, 500 Francisco St., Transit Car Cleaner
Roy W. Haver, 576 Lisbon St., Marble Shopman
Guadalupe Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Jeanne L. Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Grocery Clerk
Roosevelt Lancaster, 170 Ladyard St., Transit Car Cleaner
Lena M. Quintana, 3331 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Alfred Lent, 1475 Church St., Electrical Mechanic
George Williams, Sr., 335 Hearst Ave., Retired
Beatrice L. Dunbar, 430 Thornton Ave., Retired
Vicente Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Driver
Gabriela, R. Wilkerson, 1347-15th Ave., Cashier

Statement are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
LIBBY DENEBEIM

My address is 200 St. Francis Blvd.
My occupation is Incumbent School Board Member
My qualifications for office are: Four years ago you elected me to the school board. I am deeply grateful.

I have worked hard. Student achievement scores improved, enrollment stabilized. We strengthened significantly special programs and alternative schools.

There remains much work to do. As a mother of six public school educated children, former teacher and experienced school board member, I know how our schools should work.

Many children today will finish school in the 21st Century. For all our children we must plan for the future, reaffirm our commitment to excellence, use school dollars prudently and ensure the momentum for improvement in our schools continues.

Libby Denebeim

The sponsors for Libby Denebeim are:
Robert S. Denebeim, 200 St Francis Blvd., Businessman
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
William K. Cohenitz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Patricia F. Costello, 2838 Green St., Community Leader
Carlotta T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Zuretti L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA Volunteer
Richard D. Hongo, 124 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Cynthia Brown Kelly, 460 Magellan St., Homemaker
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., Board of Education Member
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan St., Lt. Governor
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Attorney/Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., Mental Health Director
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder, 130 Casitas Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
Philip Bruce Raful, 962 Clayton St., SF Open Space Committee Member
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor/Gay Leader
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher/President, SF Federation of Teachers
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Yori Wada, 505-4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Pansy Ponzi Walzer, 649 San Jose Ave., Contract Compliance Representative
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Malcolm S.M. Watts, 270 Sealcliff Ave., Physician

GEORGE DYKSTRA

My address is 949 Filbert Street
My occupation is Community Services Director
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am trained in government finance and Citizen Participation decision making. Long community involvement includes director, Educational Services, Executive Board of Golden Gate Child Development, Saint Mary's Hospital Board and Yick Wo Elementary Parent's Committee. My education includes a B.A., emphasizing Education and U.S.C. graduate school.

I am practical, experienced and positive. I expect more from students, parents and teachers. I promise fiscal responsibility. I respect and support parent participation, teacher professionalism and every student's right to learn in well-equipped, orderly schools. Opportunity, Technology and Basics.

Vote for me! I will keep children in the picture.

George Dykstra

The sponsors for George Dykstra are:
Lisa Bardaro, M.D., 880 Sloat Blvd., Physician
Millicent E. Buxton, 80 Parnassus Ave., Educator
Robert T. Corrado, 18 Miramar Ave., Administrator
Teresia M. D'Auray, 75 Heather St., Environmental Fund Raising
Kathleen DePaola, 949 Filbert St., Psychologist
Kathleen Dykstra, 949 Filbert St., Legal Administrator
Linda J. Gaudreau, 858-26th Ave., Director of Medical Records
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Attorney-at-Law
Ann K. Howell-Iom, 904 Cortland Ave., Volunteer Coordinator
D. S. Isaba, 44 Escandido Ave., Associate Professor
Martha Anne Jessup, 2562 Diamond St., Educator
Deborah L. Keller, 1466-41 Ave., Student
Katherine Lamberti, 63 Winfield St., Women's Services Consultant
Mim Landry, 1040 Cole St., Student
Nick Lederer, 79 Mipah St., Executive Director, Senior Services
Dr. Thomas S. McCoy, 1446 Clay St., Professor
Tim P. Mess, M.D.35 Landy's Ln., AIDS Clinician-Researcher
Susan L. Mok, 1332-38th Ave., Acupuncturist
Marcia Quackenbush, 1690-27th Ave., Social Worker
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingrerson Ave., Executive Director
CÁHEED
Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Director of Health
Kenneth M. Sims, 1454 Palou Ave., Associate Director Child Development Center
David E. Smith, 80 Parnassus Ave., Physician
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Montecello St., Attorney
Michael Stephanian, 2109 Baker St., Attorney
Harvey W. Q. Tse, 70 Lomita Ave., Businessman
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Methodist Minister
E. Leif Zerin, 1526-26th Ave., Editor

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

MARTIN ENG

My address is 665 Pine Street
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant

My qualifications for office are: Twelve years of community and civic service.

Eng supports:
• Our children’s inherent right for education.
• Regain respect for our teachers.
• Strict measures to halt school violence. Stop the sale and use of street drugs.
• Higher standards for teachers and students.
• Encourage teachers and parents participation within the Board.
• Merit pay to outstanding teachers.

Maximize income: Lease surplus school properties. End mismanagement by incompetent Board members. Eng opposes:
• Current programs teaching alternative lifestyle to our precious children. A violation of the First Amendment.
• Board members extravagant dinner meetings with liquor paid for by taxpayers. A blatant violation of the law.

Martin Eng

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:

John Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Real Estate Broker, Former Supervisor
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Commissioner, Contractors State License Board, State of California
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor, Former Supervisor
Dr. John B. Tsu, 2 Denslow Dr., Education Commissioner
Melvin M. Belli, 2930 Broadway, Lawyer
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Terr., Landmark Preservation Board
Steven J. Doi, 1521 Lark St., Attorney
C. Mackey E. Salazar, 183 San Benito Way, City Planning Commissioner
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli St., Retired
John T. Fang, 170 Gelett Dr., Publisher, State Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Robert Silvestri, 300-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Anna Kyle Pauzewang, 30 Cunningham Pl., Legal Assistant
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Vice President, District One Political Action
Kevin G. Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Property Consultant
John S. Tang, M.D. 2184 Funston Ave., Physician
Timothy A. Tosto, 670 Ashbury St., Attorney
Jung Roy Gee, 665 Pine St., Investor, Education Researcher
William Bernstein, 1000 Franklin St., Attorney
Robert P. Varini, 10 Miller Pl., Chairmain-Police Data Systems
Frank S. Yee, 358 Los Palmas Dr., Real Estate Finance; Teacher
Rev. Charles A. McIlhenny, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
William Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney at Law
F. Theodore Klett, 2801 Broadway, Lawyer
Robbyn Tom, 28 Annapolis Ter., V.P.-Branch Manager, S & L
Velma Petersile, 665 Pine St., Teacher
Ed Pond, 16-36th Ave., Insurance broker/Accountant
S.M. Saroyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Business Enterprises/Lawyer
Frank N. Aiko, 2805 Vallejo St., Restaurant Owner
W.F. O’Keefe, Sr., 444 Coret Ave., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Assn.

EUGENE S. HOPP, M.D.

My address is 601 Van Ness Avenue, Opera Plaza
My occupation is Physician

My qualifications for office are: For the past thirteen years I have served on the Board of Education as an independent voice committed to the goal of educating all our children to their fullest potential. The current stress on teaching the basics must continue, combined with offerings of high technology and vocational courses designed to prepare our diverse student population for a changing future. I stand for an integrated educational program and welcome parents and the public to assist me in this challenge.

Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Eugene S. Hopp are:

Molly M. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Telecommunications Executive
Dianne Feinstein, 3020 Lyon St., Mayor
Joseph L. Alito, 2510 Pacific Ave., Attorney
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, Vice President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr, 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Police Commissioner
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Castitas Ave., Police Commissioner
Alan S. Wong 1280 Ellis St., Commissioner, Community College
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member S F Community College
John F. Crowely, 87 Los Palmas Dr., Labor Official
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Amos J. Castro, 1401 California St., Physician
Henry Der, 430-45th Ave., Civil Rights Administrator
Harry Holland, 637 Powell St., Economist
Saul Madfes, 75 Country Club Dr., Retired, School Admin.
Jo Brimbaum, 1750 Taylor St., Housewife
Antila H. Sanchez, 44 Restani Way, Social Worker
Chadwick C. Ertola, 660 Greenwich St., Attorney
Naomi Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Businesswoman
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
Raye G. Richardson, 1714 Fillmore St., Assoc. Professor
Max L. Christensen, 2 Heather Ave., Clergyman
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave, Asst Business Mgr.
Leo J. Murphy, Sr., 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Lan E. De Lara, 2 Lenox Way, Educational Consultant
Gregory C. Lintner, 2660 Webster St., Realtor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
The sponsors for Terry Hugunin are:

Carlos Altimirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altimirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altimirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altimirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 337 Belvedere St., Forklift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James R. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elmora Hardy, 143 Paralones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lilia G. Porillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninoc, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

The sponsors for James Legare are:

Carlos Altimirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altimirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altimirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altimirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 337 Belvedere St., Forklift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elmora Hardy, 143 Paralones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lilia G. Porillo, 158 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninoc, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
Nicholas E. Vallejo, 875 Cayuga Ave., Electrician
John Vozitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
JO ANNE MILLER

My address is 1920 Quint Street
My occupation is Parent and Teacher
My qualifications for office are: I am the mother of two children in San Francisco Public Schools. I believe in the Public School System, and have a personal interest in its quality and effectiveness. I am a teacher of the blind. I am President of the Glen Park School Site Advisory Committee, and hold other elected civic offices.

The lack of parent representation on the School Board has contributed to a lack of parent and citizen involvement, a lack of long-term planning and vision in school administration, and a failure to commit the School District to a plan and goal of excellence for all children.

JoAnne Miller

BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones Street
My occupation is Transportation Analyst
My qualifications for office are: I believe I have provided outstanding leadership during my eight years on the San Francisco Board of Education. This is evidenced by the fact that test scores have improved and new programs have attracted students back from private schools.

As an active parent, I know San Francisco’s schools first-hand. I have worked conscientiously for our children’s future. I have the vision and I have gained the practical skills necessary to continue building our school district into one of the best large urban districts in the nation.

Benjamin Tom

The sponsors for JoAnne Miller are:

Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Jeff Brown, 850-41th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Angel D. Contreras, 1461 Alabama St., Administrator of Headstart
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Dacot St., President, San Francisco NOW
Linda Frees, 830-83th Ave., Community Organizer
Bob Geary, 2578 Great Highway, San Francisco Police Officer
Louise Harvey, 673 Fulton St., Educational Consultant
Marilee Hearn, 3030 Turk Blvd., Teacher
Michael Hennensley, 251 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney Investigator
Darby Inouye, 251 Gates St., Attorney
Cleve Jones, 878-87th St., Legislative Assistant
LeRoy King, 75 Tampa Ln., Reg. Dir., ILWU
Myna G. Kofp, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Jean E. Kortum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member of Board of Supervisors
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Business Executive
Hugh B. Miller, 355 Roosevelt Way, Attorney
John L. Molinaro, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Constance O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
James E. O’Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Taxi Cab Owner
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director
CAHEED, Inc.
Jerry Ringerman, 415 Crestmont Dr., Executive Director, San Francisco Jewish Community Center
Thelma Shelley, 70 Ewer St., Performing Arts Administrator
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., President, AAFUM

The sponsors for Ben Tom are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Wendy Nelder, 150 Castita Ave., Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Supervisor, San Francisco
John L. Molinaro, 31-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commission
William K. Cobrants, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director, CYO
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Ben L. Hov, 1 Villa Ter., Banker, Executive
Ahn S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker, Community College Board Member
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director, Pre-Trial Diversion Project
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor, City and County
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrack St., Planning Commissioner
Myra G. Kofp, 1940-12th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sadona M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Board Member School Administrator
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Sally Russell, 349 Lexington St., Labor Business Representative
Jeff Brown, 850-41th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Julie Tung, 788-18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College
Michael Hennensley, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblemember, 16th District
Candidates for College Board

**ERNEST “CHUCK” AYALA**

My address is 4402-20th St.
My occupation is Youth Director, CYO-Urban Development Division

**My qualifications for office are:** Native San Franciscan, South of Market neighborhood. Attended public and parochial schools, including City and Lone Mountain Colleges. My involvement in community development and public service is with youth in Education, Employment and Delinquency Prevention, in addition to developing and administering Senior Citizens and Veterans Programs. Business management background in labor, insurance and real estate provides me with a balanced approach to fiscal and administrative objectives of the Community College District. My continued goal for the Community College District is to retain its open door policy and remain responsive to the educational and vocational needs of the people.

*Ernest Chuck Ayala*

**The sponsors for Ernest “Chuck” Ayala are:**
Reginald Y. Alexander, 182 Middlefield Dr., Vice Chancellor, Certificated
Bernice E. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Homemaker
Louis F. Bannale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College District
Robert E. Burton, 8 Stolt Blvd., Member, S.F. Community College Board
Vincent J. Callan, 4038 19th St., Retired
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot St., Housewife
Marjorie M Colvin, 1835 Franklin St. #1403, Housewife
Peter J. Fatsoho, 30 Grand View Ave., Businessman
William L. Fazio, 110 Inverness Dr., Asst District Attorney
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripleys St., Management Consultant
Al Graft, 509 Bryant St., Businessman
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Marcel Kapsulica, 2570 22nd Ave., Dental Laboratory-Owner
Louis E. Lagger, 4001 21st St., District Manager, Packing Co.
Dorothy J. Lubetich, 15 Florintine St., Retired
Ernestine A. McGoldrick, 4442 20th St., School Clerk/Housewife
Charles W. Meyers Sr., 1789 Eucalyptus St., State Assembyman—Retired
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Susan Ann Rualdles, 340-A Taraval St., Florist
Dr. David J. Saachez, Jr., 443 Bartlett St., President, S.F. Police Commission
Bob (Robert) Schmidt, 4048 21st St., Librarian
Thomas N. Scott, 1915-1/2 Broderick St., Youth Program Coordinator
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba St., Educator/Police Commissioner
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 505 41st Ave., U.C. Regent
Bernard J. Ward, 3300 Kirkham St., Atty at law
Bill Zorazakis, 543 Castro St., Shoe Repairer

---

**AMOS CLEOPHILUS BROWN**

My address is 111 Lunado Way
My occupation is Clergyman
My age is 43

**My qualifications for office are:** I hold the B.A., M.D. and D.D. degrees. 16 years of public service on board of education throughout the U.S. more than qualify me for the position.

My services on the Board of Governors since 1971 reflect that I am competent and able to work with team of governors to ensure the delivery of a quality education system for all persons in our community with desire training for marketable skills. Community College also must serve the needs of those who for various reasons have not had the opportunity of going to other institutions of higher learning for training.

*Amos C. Brown*

**The sponsors for Amos C. Brown are:**
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Member, College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Stolt Blvd., Member, Community College Board
Priscilla A. Dennard, 210 Broad St., Secretary
James Gordon Emerson, Jr., 175 Beaumont St., Clergyman
Mayor Diamon Feinstein, 250 Lyon St., Mayor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Zelma R. Harrison, 1957 Hayes St., Bookkeeper
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Grunkel A. Jackson, 257 Kensington Way, Retired
Clifton R. Jeffers, 1883 14th Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Wylie B. Kenneth, 900 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor
John L. Motomori, 30 16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Laurana Newkirk, 554 Brussels St., System Support Librarian
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Naomi Shines, 756 Page St., Fiscal Clerk
Rabbi Malcolm M. Sparer, 1059 Clement St., Rabbi
Julie Tong, 788 16th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 HilItalian St., Minister
Hamidil A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergyman
Tomothy R. Wolford, 91 Sanchez, President, College Board
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Candidates for College Board

PATRICK C. FITZGERALD

My address is 128 Detroit Street
My occupation is San Francisco County Central Committee, 16th Assembly District.
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: * Am married, father of three children and a homeowner
  * Graduated: St. Ignatius College Prep. and City College of San Francisco
  * Elected San Francisco County Central Committeeman (since 1970)
  * California State Central Committeeman (since 1978)
  * Attended San Francisco 1984 National Presidential Convention for Mondale-Ferrero
  * Served on San Francisco City Government CATV Task Force Educational Access Committee
  * Instrumental in adoption of San Francisco City College Labor Studies Program
  * Great Nephew of former San Francisco County Supervisor Tom O'Dowd
  * Past Secretary San Francisco County Central Committee
  * Strong opponent 1983 Feinstein Recall
  * Successfully fought open forum

Support Propositions: 33 (disabled homeowners) and 40 (political campaign reform).

Patrick C. Fitzgerald

The sponsors for Patrick C. Fitzgerald are:
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney
Lee S. Doelen, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official
John J. Moylan, 2980-24th Ave., Labor Leader
Terence Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Marion L. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Social Worker
Patricia K. Mooser, 1762-17th Ave., Tax Consultant/Bookkeeper
Josephine Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman

Chaun Stein, 2330 Shot Blvd., Gaither
Brian J. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Real Estate Broker
Tina T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., State Central Committeewoman
Mildred K. Bird, 1762-17th Ave., Retired
Mary Ann Cowen, 134 Detroit St., Secretary
Charles T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Retired
Emily H. Shimmon, 19 Middlefield St., Housewife
Thomas F. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Displayman
Esther F. Zriott, 75 Middlefield St., Retired
Peter B. Fangas, 1223 San Jose Ave., Engineering Graduate
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Adriano Biasiotti, 131 Detroit St., Retired
A. Lee Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, City College Graduate
Kenneth J. Luken, 215 Detroit St., Carpenter
Lloyd A. Quain, 96 Staples St., Retired
Louise E. Quain, 96 Staples St., Retired
William T. Brey, 207 San Juan Ave., Gateman
Mary B. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Homemaker
Linda L. Kloebucar, 135 San Felipe Way, County Central Committeewoman

Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
Jim Reilly, 2059 Jefferson St., Attorney
Arlo H. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney

DEAN GOODMAN

My address is 825 Geary Street #703
My occupation is Retired Teacher/Actor
My age is 64

My qualifications for office are: Thirty years of teaching, an educator's concern for quality instruction, and a citizen's awareness of the need for budget control. As the first fulltime president of the Community College Federation of Teachers, Local 2121 and as a former staff member of the District I know well the policies and procedures which form the structure of the Community College and the College Centers.

If elected, I will insist on fair hiring practices, and as a member of that most diverse of all groups, our Senior Citizens, I will support college services for all adults regardless of individual differences.

Dean Goodman

The sponsors for Dean Goodman are:
Priscilla Alden, 1677 Bush St., #8, Actress
Ugo Badalassari, 988 Dolores St., Theatre Director
James E. Ballard, 2 Arbor St., Teacher
Sheldon 1 Balman, 5 Perego Ter., Attorney
Laurent R. Brousseau, 855 Quintara St., Administrator, Community College
Kimo Cochran, 1330 Bush St., Bar Owner
Donald G. Climent, 117 Ord St., Refugee Resettlement Counselor
Lauri Fried-Lee, 435 19th Ave., Community College Instructor
William Gundel, 1415 Franklin St., Credit Adjuster
Frances T. Hughes, 2649 Polk St., Legal Secretary
Donna Ibyin, 76 6th Ave., Counselor
Lynda Bergren Kall, 24 Magnolia St., Singer/Actor
Michael J. Mandel, 12 Marne St., Attorney
Donald J. Miller, 26 Leo St., Furniture Manufacturer
Jay Monn, 1667 Page St., Business Representative
Allen Nomin, 177 Bocana St., Theatrical Photographer
Judy Winn-Bell Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Teacher/Author/Editor
Roger E. W-B Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Publisher
Frank Reilly, 3415 Divisadero St., Advertising/Actor
James J. Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Rev. James E. Sandmire, 452 Buchanan St., Minister
Eve Stoddard, 180 Diamond St., Probate Administration
Daniel A. Sullivan, 1590 Sacramento St., Attorney
Doug Tramtham, 701 Taylor St., Plumber
Sigrid Wurschmidt, 1142 DeHaro St., Actress
Samuel L. Zanze, 2581 25th Ave., Businessman
Candidates for College Board

ANDRE F. Pehargou
My address is 3840 Fulton Street
My occupation is Civil Servant
My qualifications for office are: I have been a resident of San Francisco for 34 years. I am a graduate of California State University San Francisco; San Francisco City College, and Lowell High School.

Most taxpayers are not benefitting from the Community College System due to lack of information and lack of convenient locations.

As a Board member, I will advocate a strong academic curriculum; More neighborhood locations to facilitate Senior citizens and working taxpayers; Better utilization of present facilities, and a decrease in tuition fees for City residents.

If you want expanded services to help benefit you, give me your support on election day.

Andre F. Pehargou

The sponsors for Adre F. Pehargou are:
William Angelopoulus, 59 Prague St., Employed
Renee Boulay, 605 Arguello Blvd., Retired
Josephine Buchiotti, 353 25th Ave., Retired
Andre Carrey, 487 2nd Ave., Retired
James Edward Coleman, 620 Bans St., Supervisor
Alice Crovere, 1827 Balboa St., Part Time Office Worker
Robert S. Fiahavan, 151 Buchanan St., Operations Officer, S. F. Airport
Emma Garrigues, 2702 Anza St., Retired
Diana Hantman, 361 25th Ave., Teacher
Rose Hantman, 720 La Playa St., #307, Retired
Paulette Henderson, 798 Naples St., Retired
Paul Keplinger, 3832 Fulton St., Concierge
Anna Konor, 3315 Irving St., Retired
James Courtenay Kovach, 1282 43rd Ave., Lithographer
Eva Lim, 3832 Fulton St., Asst. Paymistress
D. Martin, 87 Seward St., Supervisor

JULIE TANG
My address is 788-18th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor's degree in Psychology from the University of San Francisco; Master's in Education from Stanford University; Juris Doctorate from Hastings College of Law; a wife, mother, former teacher and counselor; and presently, Assistant District Attorney in San Francisco.

I have served diligently, always conscious of my responsibility to all the communities of San Francisco who gave me the highest number of votes four years ago. I strive to ensure that the Community College will continue providing quality education to all students, even during financial crises, without sacrificing student or faculty needs. As the only woman Board member, I actively support women's issues.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
John Yehall Chinn, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guerrero St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member Board of Supervisors
Yori Wada, 563-4th Ave., Univ of Calif Regent
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Commissioner, Board of Education/School Administrator
Arlo E. Smith, 60 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant SF Sheriff's Dept.
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Manager
Timothy R. Woldred, 91 Sanchez St., President, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member SF Community College Board
Madeleine H. Russell, 3778 Washington St., Investments
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadr St., Planning Commissioner
Agrinio R. Cerafato, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer
Michael Hennessy, 261 Andeson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Director
Louise H. Remoe, 3723 Jackson St., Member SF Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 830-40th Ave., Public Defender
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Community Activist
Phyliss Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Carol Ruth Silver, 66 Ramona St., Incumbent SF Supervisor
Betty W. Landis, 41 Entrada Ct., Voluneer
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney's Investigator
Jeffrey K. Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 910 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer/Worker, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

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

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

Moy Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy Velasquez are:
Lillian Alden, 231 Granada Ave., Teacher
Concepcion G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Teacher
Malandro Busto, 49 Capp St., Student
Victoriano G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Mechanic
Stasia Cagara, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Sales
Rosita T. Castaneda, 18 Guy Pl., Teacher’s Aide
Encarnacion P. Cepedes, 931 Prague St., Teacher
Cheryl R. Conrad, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student
Theresa N. Fabro, 4186 Mission St., School Lunchroom Manager
Kenneth A. Guerra, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Technician
Odilia Jones, 1775 Newcomb Ave., Housekeeper
Felisa P. Misenas, 266 Brighton Ave., School Lunch Helper
Basil C. Niekerson, 337-6th St., Self Employed
Willie B. Nicholas, 1231-5th Ave., Custodian
Jack Lee Ponewash, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Production Manager
Margaret M. Powers, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Customer Service
Clarice D. Robinson, 2445 Harrison St., Teacher’s Aide
Encarnacion A. Ramos, 2700 Folsom St., Room Cleaner
Murdie Washington, 195 Highland St., Monitor
David A. Woodard, 397 Green St., Chef

DR. TIM WOLFRED

My address is 91 Sanchez Street
My occupation is Incumbent, President, San Francisco Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: As an incumbent, I am proud of a College Board that, with less dollars than it had four years ago, has kept all programs operating and has expanded services to San Franciscans most dependent on a healthy community college system for access to job skills training and a basic college education. Neighborhood college centers have moved into larger, renovated facilities. Vocational offerings in fields like computer technologies, nursing, and auto mechanics have been updated. Classes in language skills have been strengthened in immigrant communities. We are a Board dedicated to quality education open to all San Franciscans.

Dr. Tim Wolfred

The sponsors for Dr. Tim Wolfred are:
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
Willie Brown, 1200 Gough St., Assembly Member
Art Agnos, 657 Connecticut St., Assembly Member
Art Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Michael Flinn, 250-Anderson St., Chief, San Francisco City and County of San Francisco
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Melinari, 30-36th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Bill Maher, 69 Elska St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie E. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
Rosario Anaya, 320 Dolores St., School Board Member
Sotomai Wilson, 5404 Rialto Way, School Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jasmine St., School Board Member
Libby Denebhn, 165 Sibley Blvd., School Board Member
Agrippina R. Carbone, 471 Hoffman Ave., School Board Member
Carito T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Yuri Wadi, 560-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Harold Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillhurst St., Pastor, Glide Church
Bob Ross, 4290-20th St., Publisher
Sandy Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Thomas Peretti, 582-10th St., Banker
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Sal Rosselli, 340 Lurinham St., Union Official
Carole Migden, 563-28th St., Executive Director, Operation Concern

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PROPOSITION A

Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

YES 253

NO 254

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Port Commission operates the Port of San Francisco. When funds are needed for Port construction or improvements, the Commission may issue revenue bonds to raise funds. A majority of the voters must approve these bonds before they can be issued. The revenue bonds are then paid from Port revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance several improvements of Port property. These improvements include modernizing container handling facilities, upgrading various piers, constructing a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf, and renovating certain other Port structures and property. The bonds would then be paid off from Port revenues.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance improvements of Port property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Port Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

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

| Bond redemption | $ 42,500,000 |
| Bond interest | 81,761,400 |
| Total debt service requirement | $124,261,400 |

“Based on a three year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning four years after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $4,462,000 to a maximum of $5,760,000 annually for twenty-seven years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Port revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Port sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Port. Analysis of projected resources available to the Port indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On July 30 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on a motion placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 51.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The revitalization of the Port of San Francisco will bring new jobs and new tax revenue to the City. A healthy port, with increased ship traffic, will bring millions each year to the San Francisco economy.

By delaying modernizations in the past, the Port of San Francisco lost the bulk of its maritime business to other Bay Area and West Coast cities. The same mistakes must not be made twice. We must allow the Port to use revenues to finance continued improvements.

Proposition A does not authorize any new taxes. Proposition A simply authorizes the Port to use revenues to finance improvements and expansion.

Proposition A will allow for the modernization of existing container cargo terminals on the southern waterfront. These improved facilities will retain current business and will bring new lines to San Francisco. The return of the shipping business will bring back long lost blue-collar jobs to the waterfront as well as white collar jobs.

In addition, Proposition A will provide for expansion of the passenger facility, a new breakwater to protect the commercial fishing fleet, and improved rail access to the port. In all, Proposition A will upgrade and modernize San Francisco Port facilities so as to make them competitive with other ports across the Bay and throughout the West Coast.

The complete modernization effort will be done at no cost to the taxpayers. Instead, the Port of San Francisco's income will be used to finance long-term revenue bonds.

The people of San Francisco deserve a first-rate port. We urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote YES on Proposition A.

As Mayor, I have worked hard to restore our port to its historic pre-eminence as a major gateway to the Far East.

Once again, major shipping lines are docking in San Francisco. Just recently, two of the largest container vessel operators, China Ocean Shipping Corporation and Columbus Lines, signed agreements to use this port.

Not only modern cargo carriers, but passenger liners as well are being drawn to San Francisco in a remarkable renaissance of maritime commerce.

But if there is to be a lasting renewal of our waterfront, the port must be competitive with other port cities anxiously contending for the burgeoning Pacific trade. The port, if it is to prosper, must modernize and enlarge its basic maritime facilities.

That's the purpose of Proposition A.

Proposition A will make the Port of San Francisco truly and vigorously competitive. And it will not cost the taxpayers a penny.

Proposition A will authorize $42.5 million in revenue bonds for vital waterfront projects, including the conversion of Pier 80 into a modern, state-of-the-art container facility and the enlargement and modernization of cargo operations at Piers 94 and 96.

Additionally, Proposition A will provide funds for repairing the now deteriorating Jefferson Street Seawall and will match Federal dollars for construction of a much-needed breakwater to protect the City's fishing fleet at Fisherman's Wharf.

Proposition A also will finance expansion of the passenger terminal at Pier 35.

Proposition A is a prudent investment in the City's future. And these bonds are payable only from port revenues—your taxes will not be increased.

More ships, with more cargo and more passengers, mean more jobs and greater economic vitality for our city.

Proposition A will make our port, once again, a strong and lasting competitor for the commerce of the Pacific Basin. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco needs a good, working port. Vote yes on Proposition A and help bring it about.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Citizens of San Francisco are worried about the deterioration of the port. Most of us can remember when the port was a thriving, bustling commercial enterprise, and the docks were maintained, clean, efficient, and busy.

But, the port has not adapted to container cargo and may be losing the few shipping lines that it now serves.

We must restructure the docks for active container shipping, and bring in railway lines to service the docks.

We have one of the few deep water ports in America, an essential for modern shipping. LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT BEING ONE OF THE BEST PORTS IN THE WEST AGAIN!

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Wendy Nelder
President of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will permit the Port of San Francisco to issue bonds to finance needed construction and improvements. This would give the Port the same financing ability the Airport now has.

Through the issuance of revenue bonds, the Port would be able to undertake necessary improvements AT NO COST TO TAXPAYERS.

San Francisco deserves a modern, thriving port. Proposition A will help us build modern terminals, a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf which will help keep commercial fishermen in San Francisco, repair the seawall at Jefferson Street and expand our Passenger Terminal to handle increased cruise business that brings millions of dollars into our local economy.

Proposition A will give the Port of San Francisco the ability to make these kinds of improvements. Please join me in voting YES.

Sala Burton,
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A offers San Franciscans the opportunity to direct the future of the Port of San Francisco.

This measure will provide our Port with the key to the future.

We must keep pace with new developments, increase cargo and create new jobs. For every fifty new containers we move, 1.67 new jobs will be created.

This measure also includes funding for construction of the Fisherman's Wharf Breakwater, which is critically needed and long overdue.

Take part in the future of our Port. Join with me in voting YES on Proposition A.

Milton Marks,
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a waterfront city. We have a superb natural harbor, which is also one of the few really deep water harbors—vital for modern deep water cargo ships.

We have used our badly deteriorating and long unimproved pier facilities to their maximum efficiency. But times are changing. We must move NOW to keep pace with new developments, or risk enormous losses in cargo shipping, commercial fishing, and tourist trade.

It is ESSENTIAL that we adapt to container cargo that can be moved by train, truck, and ship.

Research has been done on what could give us the greatest increase in efficiency and profits for the very least amount of money. And the answer is: modernizing the South Terminal for adaptation to container cargo; providing rail access to the docks; protecting the commercial fishing fleet with a breakwater; and expanding passenger-handling facilities for cruise passenger tourists.

Prop A will provide these improvements RIGHT NOW. And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION
Arthur H. Coleman, President
James Rudden, Vice President
Gordon Lau, Member
Anne Halsted, Member
James Herman, Member

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

Fisherman's Wharf is a valued segment of the community and needs your help to ensure its economic well-being.

A YES vote on Proposition A will provide the needed financing to build the long awaited breakwater to ensure the safety of our commercial fishing fleet, create new berths and new jobs.

A YES vote on Proposition A will repair the Jefferson Street Seawall before it becomes a dangerous hazard to our visitors and to our community.

A YES vote will insure the economic vitality of Fisherman's Wharf as well as the entire San Francisco Waterfront.

Join with us and vote YES.

John L. Molinarri, Supervisor
Louis Ferrari, President
Crab Boat Owner's Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The opportunity is NOW!

Our Northern Waterfront is alive with activity—increase in passenger ships, thriving commercial developments.

Let us fuse that energy into our Southern Waterfront and take advantage of our natural deep water. That means newer, deeper draft merchant ships, increased cargoes and new jobs.

Missed opportunities cannot be recaptured. So act now! Don't let this opportunity get away.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Sec/Treasurer San Francisco Labor Council
Le Roy King
Regional Director ILWU
Tim Twomey, President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trade Council
Chuck Mack, President
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our waterfront is an outstandingly beautiful and profitable aspect of San Francisco. The port has been badly neglected, however. We need to VOTE YES ON PROP A to improve and rebuild cargo and passenger facilities.

PROP A will guarantee increased maritime activities, new jobs, the revival of our fishing industry, and the safety of shoreline areas.

And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!

For our neighborhood, and for our City, VOTE YES ON PROP A!

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors

Phyllis Kern
Golden Gate Democratic Club* Open Space Committee*
Jim Wachob
District 8 Democratic Club*
Kevin Malone
District 8 Democratic Club*
Bette Landis
Democratic Women's Forum*
Rebecca Evans
Sierra Club*
Beverly Karnatz
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown*
Richard Livingston
Adria Garabedian
Andrea Jepson
Madrid Hamilton
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Wallinda McCrea
Douglas Engmann
Dale Carlson
Stafford Buckley
Dick Pabich
Ron Huberman

*for identification purposes only
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a great port city. And the San Francisco Port has always been a leading employer of minorities.

But the Port has sadly deteriorated. It has not kept up with modernizations and improvements. And what is even worse, it has not kept up with the competition. The Port MUST adapt to container cargo, and put in railway access to the docks. With your vote YES ON A, we can take advantage of our deep water harbor, attract more shipping trade, increase cargoes, and produce many more jobs.

And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!
VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Naomi Gray
Doris Thomas
Mabel Schine
Linda Dickens
J. E. Thomas
A. Brooks
Frankie Gillette
Lois DeCayette
Joel DeCayette
Jule Anderson
Althea Carrie
George Newkirk
Elouise Westbrook
Shirley Jones
Clifton Jeffers
Joe Williams
Carol Belle
Benjamin James
Grandvel Jackson
Amos Brown
Faye Anderson
Zuretti Goosby
Stan Palomares-Criollos
Jene Rita Alviar
Ernest C. Ayala
Alan S. Wong
Stan Moy
Douglas S. Chan
Thomas Hsieh
Alicia Wang
Ben Tom
Pius Lee
Julie Tang
Louis Hop Lee
Dennis Wong
Melvin Dong Lee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our Port now needs $42 million to develop San Francisco’s maritime facilities to compete with ports such as Oakland, Seattle and San Diego.

These improved facilities are vital to San Francisco’s competition for jobs and trade for the Pacific. Currently all major west coast ports are building to meet the growing needs of America’s Pacific Trade. These ports have each spent an average of $57 million on recent container cargo expansion while San Francisco has spent nothing.

San Francisco must have at least comparable facilities in order to compete in this market. If the port is not developed for container cargo, San Francisco can forget about being a major port on the west coast as well as lose the jobs and revenue that a modern port could produce.

The Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that you vote to bring San Francisco the jobs and business that will be created by these revenue bonds. The bonds will be paid off from Port revenue and there is no taxpayer risk.

If you want to see the Port continue to grow and prosper vote yes on Proposition A.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reconstruct municipal harbor facilities!!!

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee
Juanita G. Raven
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committeeman
Bob Geary
Democratic County Committeeman
Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Martin Eng

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

When something is railroaded through City Hall on a “fast track”, it is always difficult not to join the stampede. This, however, is a bond issue in an amount larger than necessary to perform the actual work contemplated; not backed by written leases; and not backed even by “letter agreements” with corporations which supposedly will use Piers 80, 94 and 96 if improvements are made. This bond issue was rushed through the Board of Supervisors. Transmitted to the Board on July 24th, a scant six days later (on July 30th) and without a specific noticed public hearing, the Board voted 7-1 to place it on the ballot. I dissented because more time was needed for a proper analysis and public input.

Presently, the Port has a debt service requirement of approximately $104,000,000.00. This proposed revenue bond issue would increase the debt service requirement to $228,261,400.00; a staggering rise. The $42,500,000.00 bond issue would produce but $40,202,000.00 in net proceeds. The Port has a surplus of about $19,000,000.00, of which approximately $15,000,000.00 is available for capital projects. The Controller says $49,254,660.00, would thus be available for capital projects costing $41,610,000.00.

The Port is borrowing $7,644,660.00 more than is needed for these seven capital projects. Why? The Port admits it has no long-term written commitments for Piers 80, 94 and 96 which account for $37,570,000.00 of the total bond issue. How can we be assured that the bondholders will be repaid by revenues from those piers if there are no-long term commitments?

Moreover, the Port hasn’t even secured written “letter agreements” from corporations to assure that if those improvements are made, they will sign long-term commitments. Ironically, but $4,000,000.00 of the bond issue would be spent on needed improvements for Fisherman’s Wharf tenants, who generate almost 50% of net Port income, money which would be used to repay the money borrowed for Piers 80, 94 and 96. It’s like the tail wagging the dog.

Selling bonds is nothing more than borrowing money. Why borrow more money than you have to, and why borrow money for projects which don’t have long-term tenants? Be assured that even if this passes, I intend to persist in making Port officials answer those very questions.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

MOTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION A

MOTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A MEASURE AUTHORIZING THE PORT COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS TO FINANCE THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION OF CERTAIN PORT FACILITIES TO BE LOCATED AT THE PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby orders submitted to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 6, 1984 a measure authorizing the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to issue revenue bonds, all as set forth in the following measure, to wit:

Shall the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $42,500,000 the proceeds of which will be used to modernize container handling facilities and to upgrade various other maritime-oriented facilities at the Port of San Francisco’s piers 35, 80, 94 and 96 and at the Jefferson Street seawall, to construct a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, to construct an intermodal container transfer facility, to install a backflow prevention system at various locations, to replace various transformers and capacitors throughout the port, and to acquire, construct or renovate certain works, property or structures necessary or convenient for the operation of, and at, the Port of San Francisco, which facilities are operated by the Port Commission?
Water Revenue Bonds

PROPOSITION B
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission operates the San Francisco Water Department. When the Commission needs funds to acquire, improve or develop Water Department facilities, it may issue revenue bonds to raise the funds. Before the Commission can issue revenue bonds, a majority of the voters must approve. The revenue bonds are then paid from Water Department revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds. Funds from the sale of the bonds would be used to acquire, improve or develop facilities necessary for the operation of the Water Department, including filtration plants and reservoirs. The bonds would be paid off from the revenues of the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance Water Department improvements.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Public Utilities Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on "B"

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

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

- Bond redemption: $104,000,000
- Bond interest: $169,260,000
- Total debt service requirement: $273,260,000

"Based on a five year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning one year after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $3,467,000 to a maximum of $14,022,000 annually for thirty-one years.

"In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Water Department revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Water Department sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Water Department. Analysis of projected resources available to the Water Department indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on a resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The money from these bonds will be used to assure that drinking water we take from our Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs on the Peninsula is pure and meets all health standards. The bonds will be repaid from revenues of our Water Department. Not a penny will be charged on the property tax rolls or to the general taxpayers.

We have two huge lakes along side I-280 on the Peninsula, the Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs. About 15% of our drinking water in normal times comes from these lakes and others in Alameda County. For decades we used this water without filtration. Now, however, health officials tell us that all of the water from our Peninsula lakes must be filtered before it can be used. We now have a very limited filtering capacity which means that if, for any reason, our water supply from the Sierras were interrupted or reduced and we would need more local water, we would be unable to make full use of Crystal Springs water. There now is no filter plant at Crystal Springs. Whatever water we use from there must be pumped up to a small filtration plant at San Andreas before it can enter the system. This very severely limits the amount of drinking water we can draw from our nearest supply, and it is expensive. Passage of Proposition B would change all that.

By voting YES on B, you will provide for water system improvements including a new filtration plant right at Crystal Springs, for the expansion of the small plant at San Andreas, and for a necessary storage reservoir.

Your YES on B vote is an investment in the quality of our drinking water—an assurance that water from our nearest supply will be available to us pure, meeting all health requirements, when we need it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Generations ago, San Franciscans had the foresight to build one of the most magnificent water systems in the world—Hetch Hetchy, which brings water to San Francisco from the High Sierras.

Now, we must modernize the system to keep pace with higher standards of water quality.

Proposition B will authorize the San Francisco Water Department to issue $104 million in revenue bonds.

The money will be used to improve the system by expanding existing plants and by building additional filtration, treatment and holding facilities on Water Department properties on the Peninsula.

These facilities will provide safe drinking water for future generations of San Franciscans. Presently, if any of the existing facilities suffered a breakdown, the City could be forced to rely upon unfiltered water from Crystal Springs. The State Department of Public Health has directed the Water Department to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Our water is safe. It meets all state and Federal quality standards, and we want to keep it that way. Proposition B will assure low turbidity (silt content), reduce asbestos content, and prevent the spread of giardia lamblia, a virus not now found in our water system, but which could be brought in as watershed areas become more populated.

Proposition B, which will not have any effect on our tax structure, is a prudent investment, protecting our drinking water into the future. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote yes on Proposition B and help guarantee us pure, plentiful water.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED
Health Commission

PROPOSITION C
Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Department of Public Health operates the county hospitals, such as San Francisco General and Laguna Honda, and all other county public health services. The Department is run by a Public Health Director, who is appointed by the City's Chief Administrative Officer and who is responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would create a Health Commission, and place the Department of Public Health under the control of the Commission. The Commission would have seven members, appointed by the Mayor; no more than three members would be doctors, nurses, hospital administrators or other health care professionals. The Commission would appoint a Public Health Director, responsible to the Commission, to administer the Department. The Public Health Director could appoint and remove deputies to help administer the Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of a Health Commission appointed by the Mayor, and to be run by a Public Health Director, appointed by the Health Commission.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of the Chief Administrative Officer and to be run by a Public Health Director appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs of the Health Department, by approximately $8,400 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Public Health Department has a budget of over $270 million and a staff of 5000, making it the largest agency in City government. Its responsibilities are many and far-reaching: San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital; emergency medical services; mental health services; sanitation; public health education; district health centers; inspection of public and private facilities. The list is long and growing.

In recent years, the list of problems facing departmental administrators has, unfortunately, also grown. Emergency Aid stations were closed. Ambulance service was drastically altered. Proposals to reorganize community mental health services were promoted and rejected, causing confusion for all. The AIDS crisis. The investigations at San Francisco General Hospital. And on and on.

Too often, these decisions and these issues were considered in a vacuum, without public input, without public debate, and without public scrutiny.

Why? In order to protect the Department of Public Health from the graft and corruption that plagued our City at the turn of the century, the Charter placed the department under the Chief Administrative Officer’s auspices rather than a commission. Fifty years later, the department has outgrown this cumbersome arrangement. It is time to bring the administration of this important agency into the 20th Century, mirroring the management of other City departments.

Proposition C will establish a seven-member Health Commission, appointed by the Mayor, to set policy and supervise the Public Health Department. The commission will include both providers and consumers of health services. It will bring the Department more directly under the Mayor’s control, allowing for more timely responses to issues and problems. Most importantly, it will ensure that the department is publicly accountable for its actions.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Public health policy has changed and the governance of our public health department must change too.

In the past few years the state and federal governments have shifted more and more of the responsibility for public health management to local governments.

Recent experience shows that our health department is not presently equipped to manage public health pro-

grams in the most effective manner.

Proposition C will streamline management—cutting two levels of bureaucracy while opening up our public health policy to the public itself.

I urge a “yes” vote on Proposition C.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Since 1971, the Department of Public Health has been plagued with problems and crises at its hospitals, clinics and emergency aid stations. Most recently, we again faced the threat of San Francisco General losing its accreditation. These many incidents are deeply disturbing, raising troubling questions in the public mind: Why do these problems persist? Why can’t something be done about them once and for all?

In 1979, the national organization that accredits all hospitals reported that San Francisco General’s “major problems . . . are related to the lack of an effective governing body free from the political decision-making process which results in delayed activity, inadequate funding, etc.” Last January, the State auditors also cited the absence of “a governing body legally responsible for hospital governance” as a cause for “ineffective management.”

No other hospital in California operates without a board of directors. Only one other department in San Francisco (Public Works) operates without a commission. Instead, San Francisco General and the Health Department are run by a bureaucracy, insulated from public accountability.

Proposition C establishes a commission for the Health Department, one that will hold public hearing, make public decisions, and be publicly accountable. Vote YES.

Assemblyman Art Agnos  Supervisor Bill Maher  Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Willie Kennedy  Supervisor Harry Brit  Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Louise Renne  Supervisor Doris Ward
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's population is aging. In a few short years, a greater percentage of our citizens will be seniors—most living independently on fixed incomes, many frail and over 75—than those of other California cities. They will need nutritional information, home health care, and a broad range of coordinated social services.

The Department of Health, San Francisco General, Laguna Honda, the District Health Centers—these are critical providers of senior services. And as more and more state and federal programs are shifted to local agencies, the Department's role and responsibilities will dramatically increase.

How will the Department respond to this increased responsibility? How can we ensure that it will develop policies and programs that meet seniors' needs? And how can we be sure that these programs operate efficiently and effectively?

Proposition C is a big step in the right direction. VOTE YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is important for women.

Women provide the majority of services offered by the Health Department. Indeed public health is traditionally the domain of women and nurses. And while the many crises at General are too often blamed on nursing care, nurses virtually have no role in planning or organizing service delivery.

Women are also the major consumers of the Depart-
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The policies governing San Francisco General affect every consumer and provider of health services in the City, yet there is little accountability to San Francisco taxpayers. No private hospital with General's size and influence operates without a board of trustees or directors. Indeed, no private organization of any kind with a $270 million annual budget — business, corporation, nonprofit foundation, whatever — operates without a governing board. Why does General?

As General bounces from one crisis to the next, with state and federal agencies threatening increasingly drastic actions, the weakness of the current management structure becomes clear to all. The Hospital and the Health Department need a commission, where public hearings can surface problems and issues in a timely fashion; where policies can be developed with the cooperation of private providers and consumers. The Health Commission will not be a watchdog meddling in day-to-day affairs, but an advocate for General, one providing continuity, stability and a rational decision-making process with regular rules and procedures.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Rolland Lowe, M.D.
Past President, San Francisco Medical Society

Robert Aaron, M.D.
Robert Gross, M.D.
Molly Coyle, M.D.
Robert Koshiyama, D.D.S.
Maureen Katz, M.D.
Yoshio Nakashima, D.D.S.

James Cole, M.D.
John Good, M.D.
Jeff Sandler, M.D.
Judy Keven, M.D.
Robert Dickter, D.D.S.
Jeffrey Draisin, M.D.
Gabriel Escobar, M.D.
Brad Evans, M.D.
Lars Erickson, M.D.
Randy Yanda, M.D.
Stephen Collins, M.D.
Lewis Pepper, M.D.
Mark Smith, M.D.
Donald Goldmacher, M.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is obligated to ensure that all San Francisco communities have access to medical services. The AIDS crisis brought the health care needs of gay men to the forefront of public discussion. It brought home the importance of a Department flexible and responsive to quickly emerging problems and epidemics, one capable of quickly reallocating resources to dire community needs.

The general health needs of gay men and women, however, are largely unrecognized. The Health Commission will give our community the voice it needs in the health planning processes. It will ensure that the diversity of our City is represented in the consideration of these important issues.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli
John Mehling
Del Martin
Donald Cataland
Cleve Jones
Randy Stallings

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Hispanics in San Francisco strongly support Proposition C, the Health Commission Charter Amendment.

Health is vital to the Latino Community of San Francisco. We are a younger population, with larger families and with special health needs, such as those of Central American refugees. In recent years, federal and state funding for health programs has decreased, leaving community health programs in a difficult financial situation. Recent changes in Medically Indigent Adult services have also negatively impacted our community.

In addition, the need for better and expanded bilingual medical services continues to be a top priority in San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition C.

Celso Ortiz
Rafael Cedillos
Maria Degado
Roberto Hernandez
Joanna Devito-Larson
Rosa Maria Clos
Susan Houston
Artell Rodrigues
P. Braverman, M.D.
Alfredo Rodrigues
Sonia Melara
Joseph Tanner
Edgar Quiroz
Angel Courteras

Roger Hernandez
Tom Romero
Raphael Taliaferro
Juanita DelCarlo
Juan Pifarre
Rudolph Mathias
Rolph Hurtado
Alfredo Rivas
Vilma Mondoza
O. Bracker
Ray Rivera
Lorenzo Dill
Yolanda Cameros
Monica Asturias
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The chief opposition to Proposition C comes from two sources: The Chief Administrative Officer and the officials of the University of California Medical Center.

The CAO’s opposition is understandable. He simply doesn’t want to lose control of the Health Department and SF General.

UC’s opposition is more puzzling, until you realize that it receives $10-15 million from the City each year for staffing at General Hospital without a publicly reviewed contract! Why is UC afraid of having its relationship with General publicly scrutinized by a Health Commission?

Let’s clear the air. Vote YES on Proposition C.

Pattie Fong  Ellen Roberts
Ina Dearman  Christopher Martin
Patrick Flanagan  Tom Moore
Douglas Engmann  Henry Der

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

We support Proposition C.

Beatrice Patterson  Paul Vacaralli
Thomas Ambrogi  Jay Wallace
Arlo Hale Smith
Dian Blomquist  Rob Waters
James O’Connor  Kevin Malone
Dale Carlson  Jan Holloway
Pamela Duffy  Norman Rolfe
D.J. Soviero  Tom Jones
Gerard Yoachum  Barbara Halliday
Mary Vail  Sandra Powell
Rosalind Wolf  Deborah Sarvis
Gordon Brownell  Esther Marks
Jim Wachob  James Augustino
Steven Krefting  Sharon Johnson
JoAnne Miller  Eileen Adams
Maura Kealey  Ruth Gravanis
Margaret O’Driscoll  Michael Heffer
Nicerita Revelo  John Holtzclaw

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Community clinics provide thousands of San Franciscans with access to essential primary health care and preventive health services. Yet, these community-based institutions, as well as the neighborhoods and people they represent, have been excluded from participation in health policy decision-making in San Francisco. Excluded, too, is any public debate on alternatives to hospital-based health delivery and financing systems that could prove cost-effective and could better serve the people of San Francisco.

Proposition C, The Health Commission Charter Amendment, offers a forum for public discussion of local health policy issues. By giving the neighborhoods and communities input into health policy decisions, the Health Commission will enable San Franciscans to create a new community of interest and new community of action in the area of health service delivery.

VOTE YES on PROPOSITION C.

San Francisco Community Clinic Consortium

Myles Dixon  Mike Pincus
George Dykstra  David Smith, M.D.
Susan Ehrlich  Marjin Waukazoo
Patricia Franks  Jerome West
Debra Friedland  Sophie Wong
Kate Lambert
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Commission will be of vital importance to the Asian community. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Dr. Yoshio Nakashima
Louis Hop Lee
Samuel Chung

David Yamakawa
Ernest Wu
Joe Jung
George Suncin
Sophie Wong
Pattie Fong
Willie Gee, D.D.S.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is a key source of medical services in the black community, both directly through General Hospital and the district health centers, and indirectly through community and mental health clinics. But our special problems—an infant mortality rate significantly above rates in other Bay Area counties, for example—are not often heard by the Department’s policy-makers, for they are insulated and isolated from our community.

Our concerns must be heard if they are to be addressed. Proposition C gives us a platform from which to speak. Vote YES.

Elouise Westbrook
Yvonne Golden
Lorenzo R. Dill
Zuretti L. Goosby, D.D.S
Julianne Malveaux
Eugene Coleman
Naomi T. Gray

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This proposal to put politics into the Department of Public Health by creating a “commission” to direct it is an example of the misguided philosophy of attacking governmental problems by throwing bureaucracy at them. It should be soundly defeated. Currently, the City’s health officials report to one person, the Chief Administrative Officer, who can respond swiftly to any crisis and set consistent policy. The responsibility for the Department lies with the CAO, not a group of political appointees. When our Charter was adopted in 1932, the freeholders explained the rationale of giving the CAO management responsibility over the Health Department.

The idea was “to provide reasonable safeguards AGAINST POLITICAL MANIPULATION.” (Emphasis added) Their report stated the office of CAO was designed to be “protected from political influence as largely as possible . . .” and “it is intended that this officer shall be entirely independent in discharging the function of the office, and particularly, to be free from interference of the mayor, because the latter is subjected to political influence.” Although the Charter was adopted in 1932, its logic still makes powerful sense. Besides blurring lines of responsibility, this iniquitous proposal contradicts health management practices in California and the United States. In fact, the same idea was evaluated in 1971 by a committee established by the supervisors, which concluded that the commission concept, a “seemingly attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another bureaucratic layer in an already cluttered city administrative structure.” To paraphrase The Progress, the Muni is the best proof that “the presence of a commission does not guarantee good management.” Vote NO on Proposition C.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The enactment of Proposition C would set the clock back on health care delivery in San Francisco to the 1920s. As proposed, the measure would almost exactly duplicate the system of Health Care abandoned by The City in 1932 because it had become corrupt, politicized and incapable of effectively responding to the growing challenges of modern health care administration.

In 1973 the Board of Supervisors itself considered and rejected a similar Health Commission option. The board's reason was that commissions do not make effective management tools. "The Commission, seemingly an attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another layer in an already cluttered City administrative structure."

The commission concept also goes counter to sound health management practices. Earlier this year, a team of top Bay Area health care professionals was asked to identify the leading municipal hospitals in the country. None of the institutions identified uses a commission form of administration largely because commissions, while perhaps capable of overseeing some urban systems such as mass transit, have proven ineffective and cumbersome.

The argument has been advanced that a commission would allow for greater citizen input into the health department. The fact is that the Department of Health already has some 440 individuals serving on 27 Citizen Advisory Committees—more than with any other city department. The proposed seven member commission would be insufficient in both size and technical competence to do other than deal with the health care in San Francisco on a "crisis-to-crisis" basis.

As we move into the 21st Century, the administration of San Francisco's health care systems will only become more challenging. A form of governance that proved inadequate 50 years ago and was rejected by the Board of Supervisors eleven years ago as inappropriate, is not the best way to provide for our city's health care needs of the future. We urge you to vote "No" on Proposition C.

Dr. Frank Lewis, Chief of Staff, San Francisco General Hospital
Walter Newman, Overseer, UCSF
Yori Wada, UC Board of Regents
Dr. Frank Curry, Former Director of Public Health
Dr. Frank Sooy, Chancellor Emeritus, UCSF
Virginia Leishman, Director of Nursing, Laguna Honda Hospital

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

A vote for Proposition C is a vote to politicize health care in San Francisco. The authors of the 1932 City Charter foresaw this when they abolished the city's highly politicized seven member health commission and placed the Department of Health under the jurisdiction of the Chief Administrative Officer. Proposition C would return San Francisco to the pre-1932 system of politicized health care management.

In writing the 1932 Charter, the authors recognized the need to balance executive authority by splitting it between the Mayor and the CAO. Departments, such as health, which were thought to be best managed if protected from direct political influence, were placed under the jurisdiction of the CAO, who is appointed for a fixed 10 year term to remove the office from political pressure.

Despite the occurrence of problems the system has worked well. San Francisco General has perhaps the best Trauma Unit in the country. The hospital's AIDS unit is unquestionably the best and most humane in the nation.

Moving control of the city's health care budget from the Chief Administrative Officer to the Executive will create a "strong mayor" type of government which the Charter was designed to prevent. Health commissioners would necessarily be beholden to the political factions or individuals which lobbied for their appointment and to the mayor who appoints them.

There are alternatives to a Health Commission. Several have already been recommended by a blue ribbon panel of health management experts appointed following the report on General Hospital. We believe these recommendations and perhaps others, including a variation on the health commission concept, deserve further study.

Proposition C would bring about a radical restructuring of government and health care delivery in San Francisco. Both issues are far too important to be decided hastily. We urge a No vote on Proposition C.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, President, Board of Supervisors
Florette White Pomeroy, Consultant
William K. Coblentz, Attorney
Thomas E. Horn, VP, Board of Trustees, War Memorial
J. Gary Shansby, Chairman of the Board, Shaklee Corporation
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I oppose Proposition C because:
1. It puts the Health Department under the control of politically appointed non-professionals. I cannot agree that this should be done. It brings in politics and throws out expertise.

2. It adds an extra layer of bureaucracy making government more expensive and management more difficult.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Your City Hall representatives would have you believe that by replacing our present Health System with a Health Commission, composed of seven members, at a recompense of $100 per month, will improve the services.

Hogwash. Just another layer of government.

With a budget of $270 millions, 5000 employees would you put your faith in the hands of seven and still maintain the same Health Director?

What we need is a clean sweep of the present management; new faces; new ideas. The Charter provides for this, let's do it—"Now," not later.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION C

Marguerite A. Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

By creating a health commission for the Public Health Department, the city of San Francisco would create more problems rather than solve them.

Past experience has indicated a need to separate politics from health care. San Francisco would be turning the clock back to a situation in the 1920s when the city had a seven member commission appointed by the Mayor that oversaw the management of the Public Health Department. The delivery of effective health care was seriously compromised by the politicized department which was a direct consequence of the department’s health commission.

For this reason, the citizens of San Francisco at that time passed a charter reform that removed the Health Department from the politically appointed commission and placed it in a newly created Chief Administrative Officer who would be secured against political pressures.

The creation of the Health Commission would take 40% of the budget of the Chief Administrative Officer’s budget and place it under the control of a politically appointed Commission, thus negating the intent of the Chief Administrative Officer’s Department which was created to administer departments that should be removed from political concerns.

Do not politicize San Francisco’s health care. Vote No on Proposition C.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, Public Health, and County Agricultural Department; Health Advisory Board; Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the (Continued on page 82)
Retirement Board Investments

PROPOSITION D
Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?

YES 261
NO 262

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement Board has complete authority to invest the funds of the Retirement System for city employees. The Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would remove the requirement that the Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California. Instead, the proposition would require the Retirement Board to make investments with the care and skill that a prudent person would make under similar circumstances.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the way the Retirement Board invests pension money. Instead of making only those investments which are legal for insurance companies, the Board would be able to make any investments that a prudent person would make.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Retirement Board to keep making only the same kind of investments which are legal for insurance companies.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-5 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.


Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, increase the cost of government. However, as a result of its authorizing additional flexibility for investments, earnings may be higher or lower than what could have occurred absent this amendment.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 63.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote YES on Proposition D.

The purpose of Proposition D is to clarify the investment responsibility of the Retirement Board and to add language expressly to comply with the recently enacted State Constitutional amendment on fiduciary standards for public pension plans (Proposition 21, June 1984).

Since 1932, the charter has referred to the Insurance Code as the guideline for pension investments.

Insurance Code investment requirements are unsuitable to current pension fund investment practices and severely restrict the ability of the Retirement Board to manage the fund to achieve the best possible investment return for the City and County of San Francisco and the members of the Retirement System.

The added new language will establish firm guidelines for the Retirement Board to discharge its responsibility as the fiduciary for the Retirement Fund. This new language will also serve as increased protection for members of the Retirement System by applying recognized fiduciary standards for which there is considerable statutory and case law.

In summary, the proposed charter amendment serve a dual purpose: it removes obsolete and ambiguous language and brings the Retirement System into compliance with the State Constitution. Both changes will enhance and improve the System’s investment capabilities and the ability to achieve its goals and objectives.

Proposition D is endorsed and supported by the Retirement Board and the Board of Supervisors.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This is a worthwhile Charter amendment which updates obsolete and ambiguous provisions on how the Retirement Board can invest funds. It institutes standards consistent with a recent voter-approved amendment to the California Constitution. Investment practices have been refined dramatically in the past 50 years, and income and appreciation choices have increased tremendously. The investment professionals working for the Retirement System now are prevented from making the very prudent investments possible, and City employees and taxpayers are, thus, prejudiced and hurt.

Present investment rules are based upon the State Insurance Code, which contravenes contemporary investment practices. Proposition D will give more latitude in making high-return investments, but will also retain vigorous guidelines on investment of Retirement System funds while increasing the protection of City employees. It will save money for taxpayers by enabling a better return on Retirement System assets. It’s logical. That’s why I recommend a “yes” vote.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

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

3.673 Pensioners, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive, and may continue to receive, benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system, and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies in California.

The retirement board shall discharge its duties with respect to the system with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with these matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like aims.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

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

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

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

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

---

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ________________________________________________________________

Address ________________________________ Apt. # __________

Telephone No. (required) ________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) ________________________________

Signature __________________________________________________________
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would provide that the City contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for a least one year prior to the employee’s death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the health care fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Bill Mulher.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs and present membership data of the Health Service System, in excess of $990,000 per year.”
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This charter amendment calls for extending a limited measure of aid from the City and County of San Francisco for the health care of the surviving spouse of an active or retired City employee.

Under existing statute, the City and County and its employees, active or retired, share the cost of health care for the employee, their spouse and children. However, upon the death of the employee, the City and County’s share of payments to the health care system stops.

Thus, the surviving spouse is compelled to pick up the entire cost for the health care plan while struggling to survive on a reduced family income and, at the same time, contend with ever increasing medical/hospital expenses and everyday living costs for themselves and eligible family dependents.

Proposition E will allow the City and County to continue paying its share into the health care system and not force the surviving spouse and eligible family dependents to assume the entire financial burden for health care payments.

Since the number of surviving spouses affected is very small, less than 1400, the cost to the taxpayer for the City and County is minimal.

The changes proposed by Proposition E should have been made many years ago; it is long overdue. We urge you to support this important measure.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Justice tempered with compassion. VOTE YES. Surviving spouses of City workers receive an automatic 50% cut in retirement pay upon the death of their partners. Why further burden this small group by withdrawing subsidy for health care?

The Retirement System actuary has officially confirmed that the average pension check for this group is $300.00 per month; incidentally, below the nationally quoted poverty level.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Health Service Board which administers the health benefits provided to active and retired employees and their dependents fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the surviving spouse upon the death of a retired employee.

This financial problem is especially acute because a surviving spouse’s pension is cut by 50% at the death of the employee and because of the high cost of medical insurance. Medical cost increases have outpaced general inflation rates over the last three (3) years by about two to one.

We urge your “YES” vote on Proposition “E” on the basis of need and equity.

Abraham Bernstein, M.D., President
Health Service Board of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Surviving spouses of city employees need this for a relatively comfortable widowhood. Let’s extend a small measure of consideration to those who are left on their own.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Proposition E if approved would require the city to subsidize the health premiums of the surviving spouses of non-uniformed city employees. The cost to the city would amount to $990,000 per year and give city employees a benefit that is not normally enjoyed by workers in private industry.

The majority of private employees have health plans that allow surviving spouses to be members of such plans but the employer does not subsidize the premiums of these survivors in anyway. Being permitted to join a group plan that provides comprehensive coverage at a reasonable rate is a sufficient benefit in and of itself.

If this amendment is approved it will violate the spirit of the Charter provision that sets city employee salaries and benefits at the average of that which prevails in the metropolitan Bay Area. We believe in fair treatment and compensation for city employees and our current rules provide exactly that.

Vote No on Proposition E.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of members and retired persons of the parking authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons.

A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

The city and county, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of “the average contribution,” as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. 1984 shall be effective July 1, 1973 1985.

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

PROPOSITION F

Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?

YES 267
NO 268

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, who is a member of the Retirement System is entitled to a death benefit of six months salary if he or she dies, regardless of cause, before retirement. The benefit is paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would provide that if an officer or employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, is injured through external and violent means in the course of employment and the employee dies within 180 days of the injury, an additional benefit of 12 months salary would be paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to pay an additional benefit of 12 months salary to a city employee who dies from an injury caused by external and violent means in the course of employment.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to provide an additional death benefit to these city employees who die from external and violent means in the course of employment.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the number of employees and their respective salary rates which qualify for payment under the provisions of this proposed amendment. Based on experience to date, the cost of this additional amount should not be substantial.”
Employee Death Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F provides a small compensation for the survivor of a city employee (non Police or Fire) killed in the line of duty. Let's agree to this minor expenditure for the survivors of those who have died in city service.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Only rarely is a city employee killed in the line of duty, but death can come with fierce suddenness.

Two Muni workers were crushed by cable car machinery in 1978; the following year, two Water Department employees were murdered at the Lake Merced Pumping Station; and in March 1981, a Hetch Hetchy lineman fell to his death.

For the families of the vast majority of city workers, there is little protection when death comes. Police officers and fire fighters already have special death benefits.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Proposition F is designed to correct a serious inequity on behalf of miscellaneous members of the Retirement System who are killed in line of duty or who die as a result of a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury.

Under current charter provisions, a designated beneficiary of a member who dies in the course of employment from any cause receives the member’s contributions to the system, plus six months’ salary.

Proposition F focuses only on those members who are killed in the line of duty or who die within 180 days from a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury. Beneficiaries of such members will be accorded an additional insurance benefit of twelve months’ salary.

The payment of additional compensation to a designated beneficiary will be subject to the independent hearing officer process as set forth in the City charter.

Proposition F is fair and equitable and, based on actuarial projections, the cost is minimal.

Proposition F is sponsored and endorsed by the Retirement Board, unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, and strongly supported by Mayor Dianne Feinstein.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

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

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

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

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

(Continued on page 84)

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

PROPOSITION G

Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?

YES 270

NO 271

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers entering the Police Department serve a one-year probationary period. During the first 32 weeks, the police officer goes through the police training program. After successfully completing training, the officer is then assigned to regular police duties. The Police Department has 20 weeks to evaluate the officer while on regular police duty. After this 20 week period, the probation is complete.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would extend the probationary period of the police officer to one year after the completion of the training. In no event would it extend the probationary period beyond 84 weeks from the date of entry. Any termination for breach of duty or misconduct would require charges and a hearing before the Police Commission.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the probationary period for a police officer to be extended to one year after completing the police training course but not to exceed 84 weeks.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the probationary period for a police officer to remain one year after the date of entry into the department.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted "No."

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Your YES vote for this amendment will enable the Police Department to provide more effective police services by ensuring that after officers graduate from the Academy and complete a field training program, an adequate probationary evaluation period exists to determine an officer's fitness to perform police duties. Society demands much from its police officers. As the nature of police work has become increasingly complex, training and performance evaluation functions must meet the needs of an ever-evolving profession.

Great expenditure of time and money are invested in training police officers. Presently, if a recruit is not deemed ready for duty, the probationary period can be completed during any retraining, thus making it difficult and costly to determine ultimate fitness for duty.

By voting YES, you will give the Chief of Police time necessary to adequately train and evaluate an officer's performance and to better ensure quality police services.

The Police Department has met and conferred with the Police Officers' Association regarding this amendment and has obtained that organization's support for its passage.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition G.

In recent years, because San Francisco has had the financial strength to do so, we've steadily expanded the size of the Police Department.

It is now the largest ever, with 1987 officers.

More and more officers are being assigned to our neighborhoods on beats and in patrol cars. We want the best officers possible.

That's why Proposition G is so important. It will give the Department greater ability to screen out officers who do not measure up to the strict standards of professionalism this city demands.

Proposition G will extend the probation period for a new officer to one complete year following completion of his or her field training.

Presently, probation starts when an officer is first inducted into the Department, before 18 weeks of class work in the City's outstanding Police Academy and another 14 weeks of field training.

As strenuous as the class work and the training may be, the real test of an officer is on the street.

That's where his or her coolness, competence and compassion—in fact, all the qualities that this city wants in a superior police department—can be observed and tested.

Proposition G will give the department a full year to evaluate an officer in uniform and on the job.

Those who don't measure up can be dismissed after a departmental hearing. Protected will be the City's rightful concern that our police officers can truly be described as the City's finest.

Proposition G is a common-sense measure, sought by the Chief of Police, that will strengthen the San Francisco Police Department. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Police commanders need more time to evaluate the recruits' "street" performance. Proposition G does that by extending the on-the-job probationary period up to one year. For the sake of our children, neighbors and all San Franciscans, I want to be sure that a police officer is fully competent from a practical standpoint, not merely because of a classroom perspective. Therefore, I support Proposition G, and I urge you to vote for it, too.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

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

PROPOSITION H

Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?

YES 274

NO 275

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and who are assigned to the Traffic Division get bonus pay. Police officers who ride motorcycles as part of their job, but who are assigned to duties other than traffic, do not get bonus pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would give all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job to get the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want only those San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and are assigned to the Traffic Division to get bonus pay.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current rates of pay, staffing and assignments by the police department, the cost of government would be increased by approximately $74,000 per year.”
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Honda Motorcycle Unit of the San Francisco Police Department has, because of antiquated charter language, been denied payment of the hazard pay which is currently given the two-wheel motorcycle officers in the Traffic Division.

Because the primary function of the Honda Motorcycle Unit is crime fighting and not traffic enforcement, the word “traffic” must be deleted from the charter in order to compensate equally all officers who perform hazardous motorcycle duty.

Please join us in voting YES for this very fair charter amendment.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

In 1970, the San Francisco Police Department created a unit of light weight motorcycles to patrol Golden Gate Park and the beaches surrounding the City. In 1977 these duties were drastically changed to counteract rising street crimes around the Western Addition. Neighborhood associations, seeing the effectiveness of the unit, also requested additional patrols by these motorcycle officers.

Since 1977 the Honda Unit (as it is known now) has been assigned to virtually every neighborhood in the City to reduce purse snatches, “red light” robberies, drag racing, and street narcotics traffic, along with demonstrations, marches, parades, and sporting events all over the City.

Also occurring since 1977 have been injuries to these highly visible, highly vulnerable motorcycle officers. Some of these injuries include one officer hit head on, and another officer suffering a leg broken by an auto which ran a red light. There have been numerous officers struck by other vehicles causing injuries, and injuries due to other road hazards (oil slicks, pothole etc.). These have increased sharply since the Honda Unit has been assigned to primarily street patrol. One officer was shot twice while patrolling the Western Addition for purse snatches.

It is obvious that these officers are no longer “just” patrolling the parks and beaches as they were initially intended, but are now assigned to patrol the streets of the most crime-ridden areas of the City combating street crimes and enforcing traffic laws. These officers on prior occasions have requested Motorcycle Hazard Pay (which traffic enforcement two-wheel motorcycle officers already receive) for their patrol of these neighborhoods and streets on the two-wheel motorcycles but have been denied because of outdated wording in the Charter. Passage of this amendment would correct this inequity.

Al Casciato
President, S.F.P.O.A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

All police officers who ride motorcycles in the course of duty face special danger and deserve the premium pay already allowed for motorcycle traffic officers.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

A police officer on a two-wheeler is often the first on the scene of a major crime or emergency. Day after day, there is no more hazardous duty for our police.

Whether on a motorcycle in pursuit of a felon on city streets, or on a motorbike on patrol in the remote areas of the City’s parklands, an officer lives with danger. Because they can cut through traffic, the two-wheelers often are first to arrive at a shooting or bank robbery or car crash.

The City Charter has long recognized the dangers inherent in this essential police work and has provided hazard-pay for motorcycle officers of the Traffic Division.

Proposition H simply extends hazard-pay to the 17 or so officers on the equally-perilous motorbike detail.

The amount of money involved is small—only $178 a month for each officer. Proposition H is small recognition of the dangers the police daily face in the line of duty.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Military & Social Spending Initiative

PROPOSITION I

(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?

YES 278
NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco does not have an official position on whether federal taxes should be used for certain kinds of defense spending.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I says the Board of Supervisors must inform the President and certain other federal officials that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether they want their tax dollars used for certain kinds of "excessive military expenditures", as defined in the measure. Proposition I also says the City's Chief Administrative Officer must publish an annual report on the amount of federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents, what portion of these taxes are used for military spending, and what portion are used for social or human needs. The Board of Supervisors would appoint a seven-member Citizens' Advisory Committee to oversee the preparation of the report.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you think federal officials should be told that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending. You also want the City to publish an annual report on how federal tax dollars collected from San Francisco residents are spent.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don't think taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending, and you don't want the City to publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents.

How "I" Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition relating to military and social expenditures had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The proponents of the petition had gathered 12,271 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 2. The proponents are officially listed as G.C. Barnes, L.J. Crowe, H.J. Hobhi and R.A. Wall.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,304 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

"Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time but should not be substantial."

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I
APPEARS ON PAGE 75.
Military & Social Spending Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

This initiative should be passed because it educates people about excessive military spending and sends a clear message to the Federal Government that people want a choice as to how their taxes are spent.

Homer Hobi
Chairperson
The Humanist Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

Why waste taxpayers' money for a handful of misguided individuals?
City government is mandated to govern local citizens affairs.

Martin Eng
School Board Candidate

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION 1

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

Section 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following terms are defined:
(a) Excessive military expenditures: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is destined for research, development, and production of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons; research, development, and production of outer space laser-beam technology weapons (popularly known as "star-war" weapons); research, development, and production of chemical and biological warfare; military aid, both overt and covert, to undemocratic and/or repressive governments (governments that violate the basic human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948 by the United Nations).
(b) Social or human needs: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is used for education, housing, health and human services, public transportation, and the arts.
(c) San Francisco taxpayer: any individual who pays federal taxes and who reports his or her principal place of residence within the San Francisco city limits; and any corporation who is considered by the Internal Revenue Service as residing in San Francisco.
(d) portion of revenues in 3(a) budgeted for social or human needs;
(e) average individual tax contribution;
(f) average individual tax contribution allocated to (1) excessive military expenditures and (2) social needs.

The Board of Supervisors shall appoint a Citizen's Advisory Committee every year to oversee the preparation of the report and to ensure that its findings are accurate and impartial. The Citizen's Advisory Committee shall consist of seven members, at least three of whom shall be volunteers from renowned Peace organizations in San Francisco.

The report shall use the most current figures available from the federal government at the time of publication, citing the sources for the computations. If the necessary tax and budgetary breakdowns for San Francisco were not available, the report shall base itself upon tax revenue and budgetary figures for the entire nation (or sub-division thereof) and produce accurate extrapolations.

The Chief Administrative Officer shall publish the report in the two newspapers of largest circulation in San Francisco, no earlier than 14 days before but no later than the normal deadline for the filing of federal income taxes for individuals.
South African Investment Policy

PROPOSITION J

(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?

YES 283
NO 284

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco has no policy about the investment of pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco and its agencies not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa. This would be the official policy until Black people are given full political and civil rights by the government of South Africa.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want it to be the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City and County of San Francisco to have an official policy against investing pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition on South African investment policy had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Julianne Malveaux, the official proponent of the petition drive, had gathered 11,404 signatures which she turned in to the Registrar on August 8.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,520 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, investment income may be affected in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount.”

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We support removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa because we believe the city of San Francisco should not support the reprehensible institution of apartheid. Non-whites in South Africa are denied freedom of association, freedom of mobility, freedom of speech, and voting rights. San Franciscans support this inequality when city pension funds are invested in companies that do business with South Africa.

This investment is also a very risky investment since any civil unrest in South Africa may lower the value of the investment. Other investment possibilities will equal or exceed current yields on the pension portfolio.

We support this initiative because we support equal rights for all, and because we believe in prudent investment of city pension funds.

San Franciscans for Responsible Investments
Julianne Malveaux, Chair
Eddie Momm, Co-Chair
Henry Clark, Co-Chair
Arlo Hale Smith, Treasurer

Hon. Sala Burton
Hon. Harry Brit
Hon. Doris Ward
Hon. Richard Hongisto
Hon. Nancy Walker
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Louis Hopp Lee
Kim Corsaro
Roberto Hernandez
Bruce St. Cyr
Tim Lennon
Beatrice Eisman
Joan Apodaca
Wardell Jackson
Susan Englander
Henry Der
Sue Hestor
Ida Strickland
Bradford Paul
Daniel Moses
National Labor Relations
Board Union Local 20

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

By supporting Proposition J, San Franciscans join citizens from fourteen other cities, including Washington, D.C., Boston, and Berkeley, in removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa. Our support strikes a blow against the apartheid policy that has denied Black and non-white people equal rights in South Africa.

Removing pension funds from South Africa makes good economic sense. International investment advisors recommend against such investment because of the frailty of the South African political situation. Significantly, none of the cities that have divested funds from South Africa have had lower earnings since divestment.

It is both morally just and fiscally sound to vote YES for Proposition J!

Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Economics
S.F. State University
Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud that we were the first state in the nation to vote to sell from our public pension fund portfolio all investments in firms doing business in South Africa. Since the passage of this landmark legislation, it has been our experience that divestiture makes not only a strong moral statement against apartheid, but divestiture has proven to have had no negative impact on our pension earnings.

I urge San Franciscans to give serious consideration to both the moral and the financial arguments as you consider divestiture as a policy of your great city.

Michael Dukakis
Governor, Massachusetts
Submitted by John Burke
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For over a decade individuals and institutional investors, including local and state governments, universities, foundations, churches, Taft-Hartley pension funds and health and welfare plans have refused to invest in, and divested from corporations and financial institutions economically supporting apartheid in South Africa.

They are investing and earning competitive returns in housing, small business, alternative energy, and other socially productive investments which create employment and prevent capital from being exported to South Africa.

It is fiduciarily irresponsible to risk beneficiaries' pension assets by investing in companies in South Africa.

Many trade and corporate risk analysts have recommended no investment exposure in South Africa. The Rockefeller Study Commission on U.S. policy toward Southern Africa, recently recommended no new corporate investments in that white, minority ruled country.

Vote to create jobs, housing and small business in your community, not apartheid in South Africa. Vote YES on Proposition J.

John Harrington, President
Working Assets Money Fund

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

"For the sake of the children of all South Africans, black and white, for God's sake, for the sake of world peace, the international community must take action, it must exert pressure on South Africa—political pressure, diplomatic pressure and above all, economic pressure." (Bishop Desmond Tutu, General Secretary-South African Council of Churches, 1981)

The apartheid system continues because of Western support. The South African Council of Churches has said "foreign investors must know they are investing to buttress one of the most vicious systems since Nazism." As members of the international religious community, we can no longer let others make decisions which contradict all that we believe in. We urge San Franciscans to vote yes on Proposition J as a specific, responsible way to express their moral rejection of apartheid.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I support Proposition J and encourage a statewide effort to remove pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON "J"

STATEMENT BY UNION OFFICIALS

The United Nations General Assembly declared South African apartheid "a crime against humanity"; and that investment in South Africa "encourages the apartheid policies of that country".

Representatives of several hundred million unionists, meeting under UN - ILO auspices, called for the elimination of stocks of companies investing in South Africa, from pension funds.

As unionists and human rights advocates we support this measure.

Committee for International Support of Trade Union Rights

Charles Lamb
Anthony L. Ramos
Jack Goldberger
Curtis Mc Clain
Frank Souza
Stanley M. Smith
Mary Anne Petersen
Timothy J. Twomey
Walter L. Johnson
Jack Henning

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

To protect American interests and to halt the spread of Communist influence into South Africa, responsible action is needed to end legally-required racial segregation and to reasonably extend voting rights.

Proposition J is an important step towards a moderate solution of the South African problem.

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman

Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee

Todd Roust
Republican State Senate Nominee

Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

WARNING TO VOTERS

Disregard any self-serving statements by Peter Ashe, Meta Stanley, and their controversial Retirement Board in connection with Proposition J.

The Retirement Board has done more than just aid South Africa by its investment policies.

The Retirement Board has made serious investment errors, produced poor investment yields, and run up market value investment portfolio losses of $160,852,320 (as of 3/30/84) with Prudential-Bache.

One Retirement Board “success” was the purchase of 10,000 shares of Citicorp for $3,473,320. The shares on 3/30/84 were worth $340,000 (90% loss).

Mike Garza
Robert Silvestri
Max Woods

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Rainbow Coalition and all members, support this initiative. Stop investments of San Francisco pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. Support Human Rights. People have a right to know that their pension funds are being used to support a racist, repressive, apartheid system, that denies basic human and civil rights to 24 million Africans. We have a right to know that a Black man can be detained in the South African penal system for as long as two years, for not having identification. That Black people there are denied the right to vote, buy or sell land, and the right to live or work where they choose. Support Human Rights. Vote in favor of prop. J.

Gale White
African American of the Rainbow
Rev. Howard Gloyd
Northern California Chairman
The Rainbow Coalition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco CISPES supports the removal of city pension fund investments from firms that profit from apartheid.

The government of South Africa, like the government of El Salvador, denies its people the most basic human rights: freedom from arbitrary arrest and torture; freedom of speech and association; and the right to a decent standard of living.

In 1983, San Franciscans said no to military aid to El Salvador. In 1984, let us say no to investments in South Africa.

San Francisco Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Apartheid continues to be used to enslave black working people in South Africa. International labor has consistently condemned apartheid, and agrees that divestment from South Africa is an effective means of pressure.

David Aroner, Executive Director
SEIU Local 535
Timothy Twomey, Secretary-Treasurer
Hospital and Institutional Workers Local 250
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director
United Public Employees Local 390/400
SEIU

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For the Black majority, apartheid in South Africa means no right to vote, unionize or speak out. Those who resist are murdered, tortured and imprisoned. Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, has been imprisoned for over twenty years. Apartheid is fascism!

U.S. companies investing in South Africa profit from low wages paid to Black workers, and play a key role in keeping apartheid alive. Say NO to apartheid and racism—Vote YES on Prop J.

Henry Clark, Candidate for Congress, Fifth Congressional District
Gloria La Riva
All-Peoples’ Congress
Johnnie Stevens
Southern Africa Freedom Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Joint Council of the Service Employees International Union has unanimously endorsed this proposal. The Union took this action because of the economic oppression of citizens by the South African Government, because of the termination of trade union rights and the arrest of union leaders, and because of the moral “Crime against humanity” of Apartheid.

Timothy J. Twomey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

South African apartheid is condemned the world over. Even the Reagan Administration expresses opposition.

Yet South Africa and apartheid continue to flourish, subjecting all non-whites to the vilest humiliations, discrimination, and exploitation.

San Francisco supports apartheid through our investment of municipal pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. By their very presence there, these companies maintain the status quo. Otherwise, the ruling white minority would not welcome these investments! We allow apartheid to continue, despite all the rhetoric we direct at South Africa.

San Franciscans can make responsible investments elsewhere. Voting YES on J, we join other cities in cutting the taproot—foreign finance—which allows the horrors of South Africa to go on, and on, and on. . . . End it! Vote YES, against apartheid!

Executive Committee
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

---

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY A PROPOSITION OF ISSUING REVENUE BONDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.312 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $104,000,000 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, FINANCING, IMPROVING AND DEVELOPING WATER DEPARTMENT FACILITIES; AND CONSOLIDATING SAID SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 1984.

WHEREAS, Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the Board of Supervisors in each instance, the Public Utilities Commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities of the San Francisco Water Department subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of Charter Section 7.300, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco by resolution No. 84-0363 adopted July 24, 1984, pursuant to said Section 7.312, has recommended that the Board of Supervisors, by resolution, submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held for that purpose on November 6, 1984, the proposition of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, as it read on June 5, 1984, and Charter Section 7.312 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission in said resolution 84-0363;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

Section 1. A special revenue bond election is hereby ordered and will be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 6, 1984, at which election there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County the proposition of issuing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of providing funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, all as set forth in the following proposition:

Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds

Shall the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to Charter Section 7.312 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing additions, betterments and improvements to the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system, including filtration and treatment works and plants, reservoirs and other water supply, storage and distribution facilities, lands and equipment necessary or convenient for the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system?

Section 2. Said revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 (herein called the "Bonds") are proposed to be issued to finance improvements to the Enterprise (herein called the "Enterprise") which is herein defined to be the City and County of San Francisco municipal water system, storage and distribution systems of the San Francisco Water Department, including all of the presently existing municipal water system of the City and County and all additions, betterments, extensions and improvements thereto. Said existing water system and the proposed improvements thereto shall constitute a single, unified integrated enterprise, and the revenues therefrom shall be pledged to the payment of the bonds. It is hereby found and determined that said municipal water system is necessary to enable the City and County to exercise its municipal powers and functions, namely, to furnish sufficient water for any present or future beneficial use of the City and County.

(a) The purpose for which the Bonds are proposed to be issued is to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, including any expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith.

(b) The estimated costs of the acquisition, construction, financing, improvement and development is $104,000,000. Said estimated cost includes all costs and expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, engineering, inspection, legal and fiscal agents' fees, cost of the revenue bond election and of the issuance of the Bonds, bond reserve funds, and working capital and bond interest estimated to accrued during the construction period and for a period of not to exceed 12 months after completion of construction.

(c) The maximum principal amount of the Bonds proposed to be issued is $104,000,000.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at said special revenue bond election the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution, and designates and refers to said proposition in the form of ballot hereinafter prescribed for use at said election.

(a) Said special revenue bond election shall be held and conducted, and the votes thereafter canvassed and the returns thereof made, and the result thereof ascertained and determined as herein provided; and in all particulars not described by this resolution, said special election shall be held and the votes canvassed pursuant to law for general municipal elections in the City and County and pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 52 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) All persons qualified to vote at municipal elections in the City and County upon the date of the election herein provided for shall be qualified to vote upon the proposition submitted at said special revenue bond election.

(c) Said special revenue bond election is hereby consolidated with the general municipal election to be held in the City and County on November 6, 1984, pursuant to the Charter of the City and County. The precincts, polling places and officers of election for said special revenue bond election shall be the same as those established.
and designated for said general municipal election. Reference is hereby made to the notice of election by the Registrar of Voters setting forth the precincts, polling places and officers of election for said general municipal election, to be published on or about October 15, 1984 for more particular description of said precincts, polling places and officers of election.

(d) The ballot used at said general municipal election and said special revenue bond election hereby consolidated therewith shall have printed thereon, in addition to all other matters required by law, the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution.

(e) Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

If and to the extent that voting machines are used at said special revenue bond election such machines shall be so arranged that any qualified voter may vote for said proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "YES" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for said proposition, and may vote against it by pulling down a lever over the word "NO" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote against said proposition. The statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material used in voting machines shall read substantially as follows:

$104,000,000 San Francisco Water Department Revenue Bonds.

 Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with law.

Section 4. If the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution shall be authorized by the qualified voters of the City and County by the votes of a majority of all the voters voting on said proposition, the Bonds may be issued and sold for the purpose set forth in Section 2 of this resolution.

The Bonds are to be revenue bonds, payable exclusively from the revenues of the Enterprise and such other funds from any source as may be legally available for such purpose and may be used by the City and County for such purpose without incurring indebtedness. The Bonds are not to be secured by the taxing power of the City and County, and shall be issued under Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County. The principal of and interest on the Bonds and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof shall not constitute a debt of the City and County, nor a legal or equitable pledge, charge, lien or encumbrance upon any of its property, or upon any of its income, receipts or revenues except the revenues of the Enterprise and any other funds that may be legally applied, pledged or otherwise made available to their payment. The Bonds, if authorized, shall be special obligations of the Public Utilities Commission and shall be secured by a pledge and shall be a charge upon, and shall be payable, as to the principal thereof, interest thereon, and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof, solely from and secured by a lien upon the revenues of the Enterprise and such funds as may be described in this resolution authorizing the issuance of the Bonds.

The Bonds shall not constitute or evidence indebtedness of the City and County but shall constitute and evidence only an indebtedness of the Public Utilities Commission payable solely out of revenues received by the Public Utilities Commission from San Francisco Water Department facilities operated or controlled by it. The Bonds shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in Section 6.401 of the Charter.

Section 5. This resolution shall be printed in the voters’ pamphlet and mailed to each registered voter pursuant to Section 9.105 of the Charter of the City and County.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C, Continued from page 61

bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, a deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy or other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

The department of public works shall have powers and duties relating to street traffic, subject to the laws relating thereto, as follows:

(a) to cooperate with and assist the police department in the promotion of
traffic safety education;

(b) to receive, study and give prompt attention to complaints relating to street design or traffic devices or the absence thereof;

(c) to collect, compile, analyze and interpret traffic and parking data and to analyze and interpret traffic accident information;

(d) to engage in traffic research and traffic planning; and

(e) to cooperate for the best performance of these functions with any department and agency of the city and county and the state as may be necessary.

The department shall submit to the traffic bureau of the police department, for its review and recommendation, all proposed plans relating to street traffic control devices; provided, however, that the bureau may waive submission and review of plans of particular devices designated by it. Failure of the said traffic bureau to submit to the department its recommendation on any proposed plan within fifteen (15) days after receipt shall be considered an automatic approval of said traffic bureau. The department shall not, with respect to any traffic control devices, implement such plan until the recommendation of the traffic bureau has been reviewed or until the fifteen (15) day period has elapsed.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county upon paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendation of the chief of the department.

Department of Public Health, which shall be administered by a director of health, who shall be a regularly licensed physician or surgeon in the State of California, with not less than 10 years' practice in his profession immediately preceding his appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician or surgeon requirement may be waived by the board of supervisors. He shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The chief administrative officer shall have power to appoint and to remove an assistant director of public health for hospital services, who shall be responsible for the administrative and business management of the institutions of the department of public health, including, but not limited to, the San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Home, Massier Health Home, and the Emergency Hospital Service, and who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of assistant director of public health for hospital services shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the institutions of the department of public health.

The director of public health shall have power to appoint and remove an administrator of San Francisco General Hospital who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of administrator shall be held only by a physician or hospital administrator who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the San Francisco General Hospital.

Health Advisory Board. There is hereby created a health advisory board of seven members, three of whom shall be physicians and one dentist, all regularly certificated. Members of the board shall serve without compensation. They shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer for terms of four years; provided, however, that those first appointed shall classify themselves by lot so that the terms of one physician and one lay member shall expire in 1922, 1924 and 1925, respectively, and the term of one member in 1926.

Such board shall consider and report on problems and matters under the jurisdiction of the department of public health and shall consult, advise with and make recommendations to the director of health relative to the functions and affairs of the department. The recommendations of such board shall be made in writing to the director of health and to the chief administrative officer.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Conventional Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center.

If in the election of June 2, 1980 November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

PART TWENTY-ONE: HEALTH COMMISSION

3.695 Composition of Department; Commission

The public health department shall consist of a health commission, a director of public health and such employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter. The department shall be under the management of a health commission consisting of seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor. Said commission shall have less than a majority of direct providers of health care. Direct providers of health care shall mean all
health professionals and others whose "primary current activity" is the provision of patient care or the administration of facilities or institutions which provide patient care. The term of each member of the commission shall be four years, commencing at twelve o'clock, noon, on the 15th day of January in the year 1985; provided, that the respective terms of office of those first appointed shall be as follows: two for four years, two for three years, two for two years, and one for one year. Vacancies occurring on said commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of each of said members shall be filled by the mayor. No commissioner may serve more than two consecutive terms or a total of eight years.

The compensation of each commissioner shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month. The commissioners shall annually elect one of their members president. They shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the governance of the commission.

3.696 Director of Public Health; Other Executives

The health commission shall appoint a director of public health who shall serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The director of public health shall be a regularly licensed physician in the State of California, with not less than five years' experience in public health administration immediately preceding his or her appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician requirement may be waived by the health commission. The director of public health shall be the chief executive of the commission and shall, subject to the approval of the commission, manage all operations under its jurisdiction. The director shall have power to appoint and remove a deputy director for operations, a deputy director for community health programs, an administrator for San Francisco General Hospital and an administrator for Laguna Honda Hospital. The administrators of San Francisco General Hospital and of Laguna Honda Hospital shall have power to appoint and remove associate administrators to the extent such positions are created by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

These positions shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter and shall be held by persons who possess the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the divisions and institutions of the department. However, any person who has civil service status in any of the above positions on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have such status under the civil service provisions of this charter. All positions in the department legally authorized shall be continued and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.697 Powers and Duties

The health commission shall manage and control the city and county hospitals, emergency medical services, and all matters pertaining to the preservation, promotion, and protection of the lives, health and mental health of the inhabitants of the city and county, except where this charter specifically grants that power to another department. It may also determine the nature and character of public health nuisances and provide for their abatement.

The commission shall inspect the sanitary conditions of the municipal institutions of the city and county, including jails and all public buildings; of the disposition of the dead; of the disposition of garbage, offal and offensive substances.

The commission shall be a policy-making and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in section 3.500 of this charter. The commission shall have the power to establish and make appointments to advisory committees as it shall deem necessary.

8.107 Suspension and Removal

Any elective officer, and any member of the civil service commission, health commission, or public utilities commission or school board may be suspended by the mayor and removed by the board of supervisors for official misconduct, and the mayor shall appoint a qualified person to discharge the duties of the office during the period of suspension. On such suspension, the mayor shall immediately notify the supervisors thereof in writing and the cause thereof, and shall present written charges against such suspended officer to the board of supervisors at or prior to its next regular meeting following such suspension, and shall immediately furnish copy of same to such officer, who shall have the right to appear with counsel before the board in his defense. Hearing by the supervisors shall be held not less than five days after the filing of written charges. If the charges are deemed to be sustained by not less that a three-fourths vote of all members of the board, the suspended officer shall be removed from office; if not so sustained, or if not acted on by the board of supervisors within thirty (30) days after the filing of written charges, the suspended officer shall thereby be reinstated.

The mayor must immediately remove from office any elective official convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, and failure of the mayor so to act shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part.

Any appointee of the mayor, exclusive of civil service, health, recreation and park, and public utilities commissioners, and members of the school board, may be removed by the mayor. Any nominee or appointee of the mayor whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, except the chief administrative officer and the controller, as in this charter otherwise provided, may be removed by a majority of such board and with the concurrence of the mayor. In each case, written notice shall be given or transmitted to such appointee of such removal, the date of effectiveness thereof, and the reasons therefor, a copy of which notice shall be printed at length in the journal of proceedings of the board of supervisors, together with such reply in writing as such official may make. Any appointee of the mayor or the board of supervisors guilty of official misconduct or convicted of crime involving moral turpitude must be removed by the mayor or the board of supervisors, as the case may be, and failure of the mayor or any supervisor to take such action shall constitute official misconduct on his or their part.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F — Continued from page 69

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

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

“Compensation earnable” shall mean the compensation as determined by the re-
The compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection F (f) of this section shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this subsection B (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this subsection B (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said subsection F (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of sixty years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty years, computed under subsection G (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection G (g):
each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied on full-time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

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

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

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

(1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection \( E \) (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

\( F \) (f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system.
provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least ten years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000), he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, ninety 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus one and two-thirds (1 2/3) percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

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

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

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7-1/2) percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (2), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the record of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

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

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision § (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of thirty years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provision of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

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

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

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

§ (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections B (b), c (e), f (f) and § (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(14) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, no shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successor in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983.

(24) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.584-5 Death Benefit

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

(a) If no benefit shall be payable under Subsection B (b) of this section:

(1) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by the member during the 65 months immediately preceding death, plus the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(2) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(b) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Section 8.584-2, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 eight years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subsection (b), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subsection (b) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subsection (a) of this section, the amount of said benefit payable under subsection (a) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subsection (b) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

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

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

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in subsection (a) of this section in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this section, for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so
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made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

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

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

Upon the death of a member after retirement, an allowance, in addition to the death benefit provided in the immediately preceding paragraph, shall be paid to his surviving spouse, until such surviving spouse's death or remarriage, equal to one-half of his retirement allowance as it was prior to optional modification and prior to reduction as provided in Subsection (a) of Section 8.514 of this charter, but exclusive of the part of such allowance which was provided by additional contributions. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this paragraph to a surviving spouse unless such surviving spouse was married to said member at least one year prior to his retirement. If such retired person leaves no such surviving spouse, or if such surviving spouse should die or remarry before every child of such deceased retired person attains the age of 18 eighteen years, the allowance which such surviving spouse would have received had he or she lived and not remarried shall be paid to retired person's child or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION G

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

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 twelve 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 Fire force shall be for one-year twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve 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 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four 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 thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated in his position without prejudice, and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of his appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which he that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotive classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall 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.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION H

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments.

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the Board of Supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its
duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in Section 3.531 of this Charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph means the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in Section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month now provided in Subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheeler motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in Section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by Section 8.361 of this Charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheeler motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheeler motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheeler motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheeler motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheeler motorcycle traffic duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph means the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in Subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firemen firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall
be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter. For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8,549.

The term "firemen" "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective rate of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8,361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact-finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uni-
formed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(b) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT VOTING

You can vote for any candidate, regardless of party. This is a General Election and you can vote for any candidate on your ballot. Political party restrictions only apply at Primary Elections (in June).

Do not vote for more than the authorized number of candidates or none of your votes for that contest will be counted. Most candidate contests specify "Vote for one" but you can vote for up to six supervisors and up to four School and College Board members. If you make a mistake and vote for more than six candidates for supervisor you can get a replacement ballot.

If you move, you must re-register. The most common complaint we get on election day is that someone can't vote because they have moved and not re-registered. If you have moved, your name will probably not be on the rolls anymore and even if it is, it is not legal to vote using your old polling place (except in certain rare circumstances). Next time you move, don't leave your vote behind; remember to re-register.

You don't have to be sick or out-of-town to get an absentee ballot. Any voter can request an absentee ballot for any reason, or for no reason. To become a "permanent" absentee voter you must be disabled but ordinary absentee voters do not have to have a reason.

Your registration will not necessarily be cancelled if you don't vote but chances of that happening will increase if you don't vote. After the election, we will send a postcard confirming the address of all nonvoters. If the Post Office or the current resident says you don't live there anymore, your registration will be cancelled. No one is automatically cancelled for not voting at any election.

It is not necessary to re-register before each election. Your registration is permanent and will remain in effect until you move, die or are convicted of a felony.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

Not: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

A 第一步
请双手将票向自动机将整张选票插入。

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.

D 第二步
确保将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，按合于二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL [STRAIGHT UP]. PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
请把投票之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票选择之后，把选票取出，放入空封袋内，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格预备为投票人应用。
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ____________________________________________________________

Address __________________________________________________________
Apt. # ______

Telephone No. (required) __________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) _________________________________

Signature ________________________________________________________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:
請寄一份缺席選票給本人，以參加選舉活動。

SIGNATURE-FIRMA- 申请人签名
DATE-FECHA- 日期

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:
請將選票寄給本人地址

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED

EXTRA APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Since this page would have been blank anyway, we have used the space to reprint an extra copy of the absentee ballot application form.

Your "real" absentee ballot application appears as a postcard inserted into this book. We would prefer that you use the postcard form because it is easier to process and less likely to get lost.

If two persons in your household are requesting absentee ballots, you may put both postcard forms into an envelope in order to save postage.

The disabled may apply as permanent absentee voters by completing the little box at the bottom of the form. Disabilities that qualify for permanent absentee status include circulatory problems and mobility impairments as well as more severe disabilities.

If you have not yet received your absentee ballot, then you are probably not on our permanent absentee mailing list. The permanent absentee voters' ballots were mailed out the week of October 9th.
LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

GENERAL ELECTION

6th Congressional District
3rd Senate District
17th Assembly District
(No BART)

BALLOT TYPE

17 6

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:

6100’s

Application for absentee ballot appears on Page 48
Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊在第48頁

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The “yes” or “no” on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請附在投票紀錄器上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知:

投票時選擇的任何其他候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上
候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投票的候選人打孔，但不
要超過要選舉的職位人數。

投票合格的非候選人候選人，請在非候選人選票信封所提供的預定空間內附下該候選人
所競選的職位和姓名。

投票任何候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指 "YES " 或 "NO " 字標打孔。

選票上有塗鴨或塗改者，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔過了，導致或弄漏了；或撕裂了，弄破了非候選人候選人的選票信封；應
把該選票退給選舉區的監選員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
### President and Vice President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. MONDALE</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALDINE A. FERRARO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BERGLAND</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES A. LEWIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB RICHARDS</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN KENNEDY SALAMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMA WONG MAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profesor de Economia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diputado al Congreso, Distrito #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Accountant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contador Público</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK, Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizador de la Comunidad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENADOR ESTATAL</td>
<td>MILTON MARKS, Republican</td>
<td>58 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd District</td>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Senator Estatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS, Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>60 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socialist Organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizadora Socialista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIA BELLI, Democratic</td>
<td>62 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade Negotiator/Conservationist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Propietario de Pequeños Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK PICKENS, Libertarian</td>
<td>64 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Propietario de Pequeños Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</th>
<th>ROBERT SILVESTRI, Republican</th>
<th>71 →</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19th District</td>
<td>County Central Committeeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Comité Central del Condado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic</td>
<td>Member of the Assembly</td>
<td>73 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE RENNE</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Political Scientist / Educator</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIANNE MALVEAUX</td>
<td>Economics Professor / Writer</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN L. MOLINARI</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS</td>
<td>Executor</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUBY T. JIMENEZ</td>
<td>Directory Sales Representative</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY ANDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>SFCC Student</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY BRITT</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANDALL BRONNER</td>
<td>Artist, Musician</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONATHAN BULKLEY</td>
<td>Architect / Neighborhood Planner</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGER BOSCHETTI</td>
<td>T.V. Ethnic Producer</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>KEVIN STARR</td>
<td>Businessman, Communicator, Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>CAROL RUTH SILVER</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>DAVID C. SMITH</td>
<td>Administrator, Service Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>JOHN E. WAHL</td>
<td>Attorney, Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Writer, Socialist Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escritor, Movimiento Socialista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Community Service Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Administrator, Administrador de Servicios de Salud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>ROBERT D. INGRAHAM</td>
<td>Political Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>ELEANOR M. DAVIS</td>
<td>Hi-Tech Business Woman, Mujer de Negocios / Campo Tecnológico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td>Management Consultant, Consultor Administrativo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>WILLIE B. KENNEDY</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician, Musico, 音楽家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP</td>
<td>Attorney / Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>JOHN SALEH ABDULLA</td>
<td>Real Estate Salesman, Vendedor de Bienes y Raíces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>SUZANNE ALBERTO</td>
<td>Administrative Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DICK CERBATOS</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON</td>
<td>Supervisor, Muni Railway, Transvis Municipales</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBBY DENEBEIM</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE DYKSTRA</td>
<td>Community Services Director</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>Motor Truck Operator, Conductor de Camiones</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>Parent and Teacher, Maestra y Madre de Familia</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>Consultant, Consultant</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE S. HOPP</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE F. PEHARGOU</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOS C. BROWN</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM WOLFRED</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST “CHUCK” AYALA</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN GOODMAN</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Clean Water Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $325,000,000 to provide funds for water pollution control, water conservation, and water reclamation projects and activities.</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>State School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance Cleanup Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for hazardous substance cleanup.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $75,000,000 to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Veterans Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $650,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Senior Center Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $50,000,000 to provide funds for senior centers.</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Property Taxation, Fire Protection Systems Exclusion. Empowers Legislature to exclude from property tax reassessment certain newly constructed fire protection improvements. Fiscal Impact: If implemented, estimated local government property tax revenue losses of less than $5 million annually, state government increases in costs to compensate for local school district property tax loss, and state government increases in income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medida</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Descripción</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA LIMPIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $225,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para el control de la contaminación del agua, conservación del agua y para proyectos y actividades de recuperación del agua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMpra-ABRiENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar el desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA LIMPIEZA DE SUBSTANCIAS PELIGROSAS. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para limpiar del medio las substancias peligrosas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA POTABLE SALUBRE DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $75,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la mejora de los sistemas de agua domésticos para cumplir con las normas mínimas de agua potable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $850,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA CENTROS PARA PERSONAS DE EDAD MAYOR DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $50,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para centros para personas de edad mayor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD, EXCLUSIÓN DE LOS SISTEMAS DE PROTECCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS. Otorga poder a la Legislatura para excluir del recaudo del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas mejoras recientemente construidas para protección contra incendios. Impacto fiscal: De ser llevada a cabo, pérdidas en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad para los gobiernos locales calculadas en menos de 55 millones anuales, además aumentos en los gastos del gobierno estatal para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida en impuestos a la propiedad, y aumentos para el gobierno estatal en los ingresos provenientes del impuesto a la renta debido a menores deducciones en los impuestos a la propiedad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>CORTE SUPREMA. TRANSFERENCIA DE CAUSAS. REVISIÓN DE DECISIONES. Modifica las disposiciones constitucionales en vigor en cuanto al traspaso de causas y la revisión de decisiones. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto significativo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT. DISABLED PERSON. Authorizes Legislature to postpone property tax payments on owner occupied principal residence by disabled person. Fiscal Impact: State expenditures estimated to be less than $2 million annually which would be recovered, with interest, when the homes are sold.

PROPERTY TAXATION. HISTORIC STRUCTURE EXCLUSION. Excludes from property tax reassessment certain new construction on owner occupied principal residence historic structures. Fiscal Impact: Local governments property tax revenue loss of less than $100,000 annually. State government expenditure of about 32% of this to compensate local school districts for property tax revenue losses.

(Proposition 35 has been withdrawn from the ballot)

TAXATION. Amends Proposition 13 adding restrictions on real property taxation, new tax measures, and charging fees. Provides specified tax refunds. Fiscal Impact: State revenues reduced at least $100 million, net, over first two-year period. State costs increased up to $750 million over first two-year period and by about $150 million annually in subsequent years to replace revenue losses to schools. Local agencies other than schools property tax and other revenue losses of about $2.8 billion, net, over first two-year period and of about $1.1 billion annually in subsequent years.

STATE LOTTERY. Establishes state-operated lottery. Revenue use: prizes, 50%; expenses, not more than 16%; public education, at least 34%. Fiscal Impact: Cannot be predicted with certainty. Estimated yield for public education would be about $500 million annually, with less the first two years. Estimated division: K-12, 80%; Community Colleges, 13%; California State University, 5%; University of California, 2%.

VOTING MATERIALS. ENGLISH ONLY. Requires Governor urge federal officials amend law so that voting materials be printed in English only. Fiscal Impact: Insignificant.
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, Elección General, 6 de Noviembre de 1984

POSTERGACIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. PERSONAS INHABILITADAS. Autoriza a la Legislatura a posponer los pagos del impuesto a la propiedad sobre una residencia principal ocupada por su dueño quien sea una persona inhabilitada. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales calculados en menos de $2 millones anuales, donde los cuales serían recuperados, con intereses, cuando las residencias sean vendidas.

FIACION DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE ES- TUCTURA HISTÓRICA. Excluye de rendimiento del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas construcciones o trabajos nuevos efectuados en residencias que sean estructuras históricas ocupadas por sus dueños. Impacto fiscal: Pérdidas para los gobiernos locales en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad de menos de $100,000 anuales. Gastos gubernamentales estatales alrededor del 32% de esta suma para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida de ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad.

La Proposición número 35 no será usada en esta elección.

FIACION DE IMPUESTOS. Enmienda la Proposición 13 añadiendo restricciones en la fijación de impuestos a la propiedad inmueble, nuevas medidas del impuesto a la propiedad y honorarios a cobrarlos. Dispone reembolsos específicos de impuestos. Impacto fiscal: Reducción en los ingresos estatales en por lo menos $100 millones anuales, durante el periodo del primer año. Aumento en los costos estatales de hasta $750 millones durante el periodo de dos años y en unos $150 millones anuales en años subsecuentes para reemplazar el período de infraestructura para las escuelas. Pérdidas para otras agencias locales, además de para las escuelas, del impuesto a la propiedad y otras pérdidas de ingresos de alrededor de $2.8 mil millones netos, durante el periodo de dos años y de alrededor de $1.1 mil millones anualmente.

LOTERÍA ESTATAL. Establece una lotería operada por el estado. Uso de los ingresos: premios, el 50%; gastos, no más del 16%; educación pública, por lo menos el 34%. Impacto fiscal: No puede ser predicho con certeza. El rendimiento que se calcula para la educación pública será de alrededor de $500 millones anuales, siendo menor los dos primeros años. División que se calcula: jardín de infantes al 12avo grado, el 80%; universidades de la comunidad, el 13%; Universidad Estatal de California, el 5%; Universidad de California, el 2%.

MATERIALES DE VOTACIÓN. INGLÉS SOLAMENTE. Re- quiere que el Gobernador urja a los oficiales federales a que enmienden la ley para que los materiales para votación sean impresos en inglés solamente. Impacto fiscal: Insignificante.

Lotería, propuesta 13, impuestos, educación, universidades, jardín de infantes, educación pública.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, GENERAL ELECTION, NOVEMBER 6, 1984

REAPPORTIONMENT. Provides reapportioning Senate, Assembly, Congressional, Equalization districts for 1986 and subsequent elections by new commission composed of former justices. Fiscal Impact: Commission costs of up to $3.5 million before 1986 election. Costs of $10,000 to $20,000 each to relocate an unknown number of district legislative offices. County costs of about $500,000 for 1986 election materials. County savings of about $300,000 in 1986 for printing costs, and $200,000 every two years thereafter. Future reapportionments will probably cost less than under existing law.

39  YES 237  NO 238

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS. Limits contributors and contributions to elective state office candidates. Opposition candidate’s personal expenditures matched by limited public funding. Fiscal Impact: Reduce state revenues by about $100,000 each fiscal year and increase state expenditures by approximately up to $1,650,000 each fiscal year.

40  YES 242  NO 243

PUBLIC AID, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS. Creates Public Assistance Commission. Limits benefit expenditures to national average plus 10%. Legislative amendments permitted. Fiscal Impact: Net effect would be combined state and county expenditure reduction beginning July 1, 1986. Size of reduction and impact at different levels of government impossible to determine. Substantial reductions under specified programs would be partially offset to an unknown extent by increased costs under other programs and reduced tax revenues resulting from reduced federal expenditures within the state. Likely, state expenditures would be reduced and county expenditures increased.

41  YES 247  NO 248

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A  Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?  YES 253  NO 254

B  Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?  YES 256  NO 257

C  Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?  YES 259  NO 260
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCION GENERAL, 6 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1984

REDISTRIBUCIÓN.Dispone redistribución para los distritos del Senado, Asamblea, Congreso y de la Junta de Revisión de Atractivos para 1988 y para las elecciones subsiguientes mediante una nueva comisión compuesta de anteriores jueces. Impacto fiscal: Costos de la comisión de hasta $3,5 millones antes de la elección de 1988. Ahorros para el condado alrededor de $500,000 para materiales para la elección de 1988. Ahorros para el condado alrededor de $300,000 en 1988 por costos de impresión y $200,000 cada dos años de allí en adelante. Las redistribuciones futuras probablemente costarán menos que bajo la ley actual.

CONTRIBUCIONES PARA COMPARAR. Limita a los contribuyentes y las contribuciones a candidatos a cargos electivos. Igualá con fondos públicos límites los gastos personales del candidato de oposición. Impacto fiscal: Reduce los ingresos estatales en unos $100,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal y aumenta los gastos estatales en aproximadamente $1,650,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal.

AYUDA PÚBLICA, PROGRAMAS DE ASISTENCIA MÉDICA. Creo Comisión de Asistencia Pública. Limita gastos de beneficio al promedio nacional más el 10%. Permite exenciones legales. Impacto fiscal: el efecto neto sería la reducción de los gastos combinados del estado y condado comenzando el 1° de julio de 1988. El tamano de la reducción y su impacto en las diferentes niveles del gobierno es imposible determinarse en este momento. Reducciones sustanciales bajo programas especificados serían parcialmente compensadas hasta un grado desconocido mediante el aumento de gastos bajo otros programas y por ingresos de impuestos reducidos que resulten de gastos federales reducidos dentro del estado. Es factible que los gastos estatales serían reducidos y que los gastos de condados aumentarían.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión del Puerto a emitir $42,500,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la construcción y mejoras de las instalaciones portuarias?

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir $104,000,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones para el Departamento de Aguas?

¿Deberá crearse una Comisión de Salud que consista de siete miembros nombrados por el Alcalde para dirigir y controlar los hospitales de la Ciudad y el Condado, y para nombrar a un Director de Salud Pública?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and Black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCION GENERAL, 6 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Pregunta</th>
<th>Opción</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Jubilaciones a hacer inversiones de los fondos de jubilación como persona prudente en lugar de hacer inversiones de carácter legal para compañías de seguros?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá la Ciudad subvencionar al cónyuge sobreviviente de empleados activos o retirados de la misma manera que la Ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o retirados en el Sistema de Servicios de la Salud?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá pagarse un beneficio de doce meses de salario por fallecimiento a diversos oficiales y empleados que mueren como resultado de lesiones físicas externas y violentas durante el transcurso y período de empleo?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá el periodo probatorio para oficiales de policía extenderse de un año a partir de su entrada a un año después de haber completado el entrenamiento pero sin exceder ochenta y cuatro semanas?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá pagarse un salario adicional a los miembros del Departamento de Policía asignados a prestar servicio en todas las motocicletas de dos ruedas?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>(Ordenanza de Iniciativa): Deberá San Francisco solicitar al Gobierno Federal que pague a los contribuyentes de impuestos si desean que una parte de sus impuestos se use para un gasto militar y si desean que la Ciudad publique un informe anual sobre los impuestos federales recaudados en San Francisco y sobre la parte usada para propósitos militares excesivos y la parte usada para necesidades sociales?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>(Declaración de Norma): ¿Deberá ser la norma de San Francisco que ningún fondo de pensión administrado por la ciudad sea invertido en empresas que tienen intereses comerciales en Sudáfrica hasta que esa aboliendo la segregación racial y se otorgue a la población de raza negra plenos derechos políticos y civiles en Sudáfrica?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

STEP 1

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

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

STEP 2

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

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

STEP 3

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

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

STEP 4

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 9, 1984.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election, such as this one, you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot.

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

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature, Supervisors, B.A.R.T., College Governing Board and Board of Education.

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

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

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 6, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 6, 1984.
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

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

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

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 25 through 41 because in June the numbers were 16 through 24.

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

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

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

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

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

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
"IT APPEARS TO BE ONE END OF THE NOVEMBER 7 SAN FRANCISCO BALLOT..."

Reprinted by permission of the San Francisco Chronicle.

(Because there are no BART candidates in your district this page would otherwise have been blank.)
JOHN SALEH ABDULLA
My address is 2533 Folsom Street
My occupation is Licensed Real Estate Salesman
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: I graduated at a local public high school. I also attended private business schools. I am presently a licensed real estate salesman.

Knowing the city’s acute housing and employment problems, I am deeply concerned of the these problems and would like to be in a position to find solutions to these problems. While I have no immediate solutions; if elected, I promise the people of San Francisco that I will devote all of my time to finding solutions to these problems by utilizing all resources available to public officials in solving these problems.

John Saleh Abdulla

The sponsors for John Saleh Abdulla are:
Saleh M. Abdulla, 155 Clipper St., Janitor
Sam Bachman, 238 Eddy St., Janitor
Richard F. Bourdon, 165 Clipper St., Mover
Peter Bury, 555 Post St., Musician
Freddie Cononica, 1419 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Alfred Catalin, 1439 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Bernard Fabro, 3609-18th St., Deputy Clerk
Robert Fulgham, 487 Joost St., Business Representative
Saleh M. Ghanem, 155 Clipper St., Maintenance
Stephen A. Halbe, 1202-23rd Ave., Musician
Jamal Jawad, 488 Ellis St., Business Owner
Zelma Ann Johnston, 575 O’Farrell St., Retired
Barbara D. Jones, 1421 South Van Ness Ave., Housewife
Alfred E. Kelly, 610 Polk St., Retired Union Official
Yhya S. Mohamed, 640 Eddy St., Maintenance
Brian Charles Percy, 333 Hyde St., Payroll clerk
Charles Ridgell, 347 Lexington St., Business Representative
Janitors Union
James Roy Sellers, 575 O’Farrell St., Unemployed
Madeline Smith, 159 Clipper St., Housewife
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect

SUZANNE ALBERTO
My address is 25 Pinto Avenue
My occupation is Administrative Secretary
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I am a Hispanic-Filipina (English/Spanish-speaking) administrative-secretarial San Francisco worker and Muni commuter and have been a resident voter since 1968.

I believe San Franciscans would be better served if suitable inquiry and evaluation preceded passage of locally needed and desired legislation and tax revenue expenditures to assure anticipated results. San Francisco’s Charter permits supervisorial inquiry into expenditures. I strongly support thoroughly researched legislation and tax revenue use to benefit the peoples of San Francisco.

All of my sponsors know me to be a capable, persistent fighter for principles and public benefit and believe I would be an excellent supervisor.

Suzanne Alberto

The sponsors for Suzanne Alberto are:
L. J. Alberto, 4156-25th St., Communication Technician
Alvin E. Bernstein, 6 Roanoke St., Computer Analyst
David Carlton Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Tape Librarian
Sarah M. Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Programer/analyst
Rose Violet Desalo, 215 Niagara Ave., Retired Bookkeeper
Deirdra D. Dunlap, 125 DeMentfort Ave., Telecomm Specialist
R. L. Feather, 111 Inverness St., Secretary
Angel Fernandez, Jr., 1419-11th Ave., Security Officer
David L. Forks, 26 Shields St., Janitor
Paul F. Garn, 2387-44th Ave., Security Guard
Joyce A. Glynn, 38 Serrano Dr., Legal Secretary
Margery M. Gray-Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Financial Administrator
Amy J. Kocher, 2006 Fell St., Office Manager
Cheryl Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Housewife
Cheryenne Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Welder
David Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Truck Driver
Ruth Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Housewife
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St., Custodian
Dewey W. McNeil, 251 Topoka Ave., Utility Engineer
Leon Medina, 1725 Church St., Retired-Laborer
Nathan Nemer, 125 Camon Dr., Retired-Producer Buyer
Patricia J. Powell, 2006 Fell St., Publishing
Patty Randall, 356 Wilde St., Grocery Clerk
Roberto Sampira, 328 Staples Ave., Sr. Drafter
Clifford C. Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Mechanic
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Clerical
E. L. Thomson, 111 Inverness St., Student
Kenneth E. Tucker, Jr., 243 Hahn St., Building and Grounds Patrolman

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

ROGER BOSCHETTI
My address is 20 Carnelian Way
My occupation is Television Producer, Host, Writer, and Labor Consultant
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of involvement with working men, women, and young people, and as a concerned citizen, I will work to implement laws which will benefit all the people of San Francisco, such as reducing payroll and business tax, so as to encourage small businesses to come or stay in San Francisco, thereby creating more jobs. Will implement constructive changes in muni for speedier, safer and effective service, I will also create better programs to help the needs of our young men and women, I would like more police foot patrol, and more affordable housing, with more concern for our senior citizen

Roger Boschetti

The sponsors for Roger Boschetti are:
William A. Arietta, 16 Wheat St., Police Officer
Rita M. Bell, 1938 Greenwich St., Assessment Clerk
Rachel Boschetti, 20 Carnelian St., Cosmetologist
George Contessi-Turner, 631 O'Farrell St., Instructor/Professor
Bernard M. Crotty, 2971-23rd Ave., City Employee
John E. Downey, 83 Gaviota Way, Nationally Known Referee/Limo Driver/Boxing Judge
Curtis Elliott, 530 Glenview Dr., Doorman
Evelyn C. Fitzgerald, 230 Stonecrest Dr., School Administrator
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Dr., Labor Consultant
Robert Jacobs, 1438-38th Ave., Business Agent
Roger Michelli, 2653 Chestnut St., Goldengate Disposal
Robert T. Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Lieutenant S.F.P.D. Retired
Shirley Robin Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Investigator
Marie G. Neihain, 319 Maynard St., Businesswoman
Marie Ann Perri, 80 Malta St., Corporate Secretary
Joseph J. Phillips, 1203 Clayton St., Attorney
John E. Ricci, 1324 Broadway, Lawyer
Don L. Rotan, 134 Gilbert St., Writer
Samuel Smith, 297 Allison St., Seaman Cook
Carmen Solis, 39 Majestic Ave., Restaurant Owner
Rose M. Tarantino, 160 Country Club Dr., Housewife
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
John J. Vidal, Sr., 1437 Judah St., Office Manager
Winston Wong, 225 Anzavista Ave., Manager of American Cab Co.
Herman W. Young, 210 Brookdale Ave., Seaman
Maya Dhillion-Zygge, 455 Chenery St., Homemaker

RICHARD BRADLEY
My address is 1 Arda Court
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As a supporter of the Spartacist League I twice tore down the Confederate flag of slavery which flies no more in Civic Center. The American Civil War did not complete its historic mission. It will take a third American revolution, a socialist revolution, to liberate black people.

Spoke Reagan's anti-Soviet war plans and union-busting austerity drive by mass strike action! U.S. imperialism—hands off Central America! Smash Klan/Nazi terror through labor/black action! Break with Democrats—enemies of labor/minorities! Build a workers party that will stop at nothing short of socialist revolution and a workers government!

Richard Bradley

The sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Daw D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 29 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikeyama, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennise Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomson, 1841A Church St., Student

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

HARRY BRITT

My address is 783A Guerrero Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: As a full-time Supervisor, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making city government respond to our needs.
- I've supported crime-reducing neighborhood patrols to protect seniors;
- fought to repeal the sewer service charge;
- worked to protect the quality of our neighborhoods and environment;
- secured funding for anti-gay violence programs, AIDS prevention, community arts programs;
- sponsored protections for renters and small businesses from skyrocketing rents;
- worked to create affordable housing;
- sponsored equal pay for comparable jobs;
- worked to have downtown pay its share of taxes;
- worked to save jobs when companies moved from San Francisco.

Harry G. Britt

The sponsors for Harry G. Britt are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Sala Burton, 8 Streat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Dr., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister, Community College Board Member
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Member, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Telfair Shelley, 70 Evers Street, Performing Arts Administrator
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Regent-University of California
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner

Businessmen
Carol Mesten, 561-28th St., President, Harvey Milk Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., President, Alice B. Toklas Club
Wayne Friday, 1095-14th St., Newspaper Political Editor
Tom Murray, 4715 Balboa St., Newspaper Editor
Thomas F. Waddell, M.D. 141 Albion St., Athletic Games Organizer

Organizers
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Affordable Housing/Tenant's Rights Worker
Edward L. Peet, 350 Arballo Dr., Senior Citizen's Advocate
John Holtclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Sierra Club
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus
Leon Brusselena, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Howard Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Andrew Jepson, 1334 Masonic Ave., Nuclear Freeze Leader
Philip E. De Andrade, 601 Mississippi St., Small Business Owner
Georgianna Lynn, 165 El Verano St., West Portal Avenue Business Owner
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon St., Registered Nurse

RANDALL DWAYNE BRONNER

My address is 1390 Market Street
My occupation is artist-musician
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: San Francisco Budget Surplus-$162 Million.
Muni Fare/Fast Pass Revenue-$46 Million.
Aspen, Colorado-Free buses ten years.
Portland-Free buses downtown.
We residents pay for more than two thirds of Muni’s cost in our taxes. Residents should ride Muni for free!
You must check out the murals supporting Peace in Central America on Balmy Street.

Please call 864-8641 if you’d like to meet the survivors of 1906, free, at the Great Earthquake Exposition.

If you want to brighten up your street call San Francisco Street Gardeners for free cuttings, succulents, and flowers, at the same number.

Randall Bronner

The sponsors for Randall Bronner are:
Seleig R. Raphael, 495-32nd Ave., Survivor 1906 Quake
Jane Dornacker, 9 Central Ave., Reporter
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
William T. Witter, 948 Haight St., Artist
James T. Lyon, 1761 Page St., Musician
F. Kelly Hartin, 119 Margaret Ave., Cateress
Julie Tuncil, 1653 Washington St., Waitress
Raymundo E. Perla, 1740 Fulton St., Waiter
Mary L. Martinez, 295 Moscow St., Secretary
Sandra Renzi, 861 Post St., Waitress and Prep Worker
Gergio Irving, 1390 Market St., Waiter
Martin James, 1139 Broadway, Bartender
Elizabeth Kelly, 2309 Pierce St., Restaurant Services
Anthony R., Parrinello, 312 Precita Ave., Artist
Carlos Gonzalez, 3409-20th St., Community Worker
Robert Burnside, 2548 Folsom St., Carpenter
Susan Cervantes, 398 Precita St., Artist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
James A. Lewis, 3030 Cabrillo St., Artist/Teacher
Juliane Malveaux, 26 Winfield St., Economist

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

JONATHAN BULKLEY
My address is 147 Tenth Avenue
My occupation is Architect, Neighborhood Planner
My age is 54
My qualifications for office are: Experienced Architect and Planner. President, Planning Association for the Richmond; Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. Member: Open Space Committee, Mayor's Task Forces for Parking, Mechanical Amusement Devices and Sidewalk Displays.

My Architecture / Planning background will help me respond to the need for a coherent vision of San Francisco as a City that works for everyone.

My priorities include:
• Housing for those most in need—singles, working women, seniors.
• Crime-free streets
• Civil service preference for San Francisco residents.
• Caring solutions to seniors’ needs.
• Eliminating Bay pollution.
• Maintaining Neighborhood Character, Diversity, and Liveability.

The interests of San Francisco Residents will always come first!  
Jonathan Bulkley

The sponsors for Jonathan Bulkley are:
Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Tenant Representative, Rent Stabilization Board
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., S.F. Housing Commissioner
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Ter., Former City Planning Commissioner
Lee Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor; Former Supervisor
Jose Luis Fernandi, 46-4th Ave., Businessman; Vice President, MAPA
Russell B. Flynn, 2610 Filbert St., President, Rent Stabilization Board
Ann Fogelberg, 2980 Vallejo St., Housewife; Vice Pres., Cow Hollow Association
Terry Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney; Former Supervisor
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Public Utilities Commissioner
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer
Ruth Gravanis, 74 Mizrah St., Glen Park Association
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Fort Commissioner; Past President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
John Hooper, 201 Buena Vista East, Conservationist; President, Buena Vista Neighborhood Ass’n
Don Horanzy, 84 Kellogg Ave., Former Supervisor
John H. Kirkwood, 1633 Green St., Member, BART Board
Bill Kuhns, 4215-26th St., Co-Chair, Open Space Committee
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner
Richard Livingston, 380 Eddy St., Administrator, Realty House West; Member, Open Space Committee
Peter McCrea, 1024 Lake St., Businessman; Past Pres., Public Utilities Comm.
Amy Meyer, 3627 Clement St., Rec. & Park Commissioner
William F. O’Keefe, Sr., 444 Corbett Ave., President, S.F. Taxpayers Association
Thomas R. Peretti, 3787-16th St., Banker; President, C.R.I.R.
Alan Raznick, 237 Topaz Way, Attorney; President, Coalition for S.F. Neighborhoods
Toby Rosenblatt, 3409 Pacific Ave., Businessman; Pres., City Planning Commission
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
Sam Valentino, 500 College Ave., Retired; Past President St. Mary’s Park Improvement Club

DIANA COLEMAN
My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I am a supporter of the Spartacists, the labor/socialists who put a stop to flying the Confederate flag, banner of KKK racism and slavery, in Civic Center. Finish the Civil War! Forward to a workers government!

Without socialist revolution catastrophe threatens mankind. We need an integrated workers party that will take the productive wealth from the capitalist bosses, and establish a workers government and socialist planned economy.

Spike Reagan reaction through mass strikes! Military victory to Salvadoran leftists! Defend the USSR! No support to Democrats—liberal party of imperialism! Smash Taft-Hartley! Labor’s gotta play hardball to win!  

Diana Coleman

The sponsors for Diana Coleman are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Richard Bradley, 1 Arthad Ct., Maintenance Building
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Berta Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikegami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 5116 Geary St, Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennysse Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

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

ELEANOR M. DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Accounting Services
My qualifications for office are: My experience with community groups and City Hall is extensive.
Involved in local politics through neighborhood and merchant associations, worked on campaigns for Diane Feinstein, and many others. Served the community through the following organizations: Vice President, Clement Merchants, head of legislative committee; Consultant to Polk Merchants; Member, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Roundtable, Vice Chair Health Committee; Board, California Alcohol Treatment Services; Chairperson Alcohol Awareness; Appointee, Mayor's Task Force on Sidewalk Vending, Parking; San Francisco Outlook, Project Manager; Member, SPUR; Boardmember Public Research Institute, SFSU.

A loyal devotee of San Francisco. I will serve honestly with an open mind and heart.

Eleanor M. Davis

EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES

My address is 695 John Muir Drive
My occupation is Banker
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Forty-four years after my grandparents were married here in San Francisco just seven months after the nineteen hundred and six earthquake. A beautiful blond hair, blue eyed baby boy came bouncing out of St. Joseph’s Hospital. Studying economics at St. Mary’s College after attending Riordan and then leaving religious life to create a conservation newspaper. Trying to educate local residents about the serious problems that we faced here in San Francisco and the bay area. If allowed to fulfill my dreams of what we can accomplish I will gladly give twenty-five per cent of my salary to charity.

Edward Michael Hayes

The sponsors for Edward Michael Hayes are:
Edwin B. Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Miriam Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Agnes Cassidy, 385 Day St., Retired
Anna M. d’Ottile, 1356 Dolores St., Housewife
Bertram J. d’Ottile, 1356 Dolores St., Retired
Mary M. Driscoll, 342-28th St., Administrative Assistant
John L. Flynn, 54 Seaview Ter., Banker
Elaine M. Gillman, 123 Randall St., Banker
Rae Grubstick, 2479-40th Ave., Banker
Marcia Kocel, 44 Mallorca Way, Bank Clerk
Berneese Langley, 460 Duncan St., Retired
Bernadine K. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William G. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William D MacGillivray, 2720-35th Ave., Banker
Michael J McCarthy, 3744-22nd St., Retired
Nora S. McManus, 456 Duncan St., Retired
Ellen McSweeney, 457 Duncan St., Retired
Aileen P. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Mary C. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Leona P. Parker, 56 Harper St., Housewife
James L. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Clerk
Janet M. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Secretary
Rita M. Piippon, 230 Prospect Av., Retired
Eugene F. Sullivan, 456 Duncan St., Ironworker
Catherine C. Tassone, 1795 Sanchez St., Clerk
Nellie Twomey, 1325 Church St., Home-maker
Seymour Whitelaw, 3150 Clay St., Investment Broker
Ann M. Willis, 1356 Dolores St., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT DANIEL INGRAHAM

My address is 1637 Noriega Street
My occupation is Political Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Over one hundred years ago two great men, David Broderick and Edward Baker, gave their lives to save this Republic.

I ask you voters to compare these two San Franciscans with the small minded politicians of today.

Pathetic Wendy Nelder says "Fluoride causes AIDS"; degraded Willie Brown corrupts us with "Oh What a Night" baccanalia; Feinstein lusts for higher office, and the rest are worse.

San Francisco can play an historic role in the development of the Pacific Basin. But you, our citizens, must decide. I urge you: Join with me and other candidates of Lyndon LaRouche's NDPC in our fight.

Robert Daniel Ingraham

RUBY T. JIMENEZ

My address is 961 Delano Avenue
My occupation is Directory Sales Representative
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: A San Francisco resident since, 1948 and a naturalized American of Mexican descent, I consider myself an earnest interpreter of human needs for the Hispanic community and other minorities. Misinterpretations, injustices, lack of communication and mutual respect must be addressed and aired. These human needs for minorities and others can be solved if we end the current world depression. The humane world economic policies of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly his proposal for joint economic development between the United States and Ibero-America (Operation Juarez) can end this depression. The port of San Francisco should be expanded to become a strong world trade center.

Ruby T. Jimenez

The sponsors for Robert Ingraham are:

Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 357 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallon St., Housewife
Andrea A. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative

The sponsors for Ruby T. Jimenez are:

Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Stanley J. Bolinski, 1909 Eddy St., Staff Clerk
Willa W. Coleman, 215 Munich St., Sales Representative
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
Patricia L. Hardy, 178 Broad St., Assistant Manager
Andrea Kanizer Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ora Lee Jones, 359 Orizaba Ave., Staff Clerk
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Souls, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
Leticia Wickersham, 171 Precita Ave.
Lupe D. Zamudio, 274 Broad St., Sales Representative

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ANDREW ("DADDY ANDY") JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street  
My occupation is Criminology Student  
My age is 57  

My qualifications for office are: I have been a respected citizen and server of San Francisco for 25 years. I'm involved in many community organizations that care for our community such as Glide church, Red Cross volunteers and the Singel partens resource center. I've been appointed to sit on the board of such organizations as "Mission Coalition, Mission Model Neighborhood and the Mission Education program, (appointed by Mayor Alloto and Mayor Moscone). I'd like to dedicate my Supervioral campaign to a few of the many people who helped me over the years, Chef Roy Hammerich, Betty Romenoff and the Mission Childcare Consortium.

Andrew Daddy Andy Jones

The sponsors for Andrew (Daddy Andy) Jones are:

Stephen Harold Irvine, 2037 15th St., Carpenter  
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director  
Joseph A. Del Carlo, 1590 Hampshire St., Chairperson of MHD  
David L. Butler, 895 Shotwell St., Salesman  
Diane Moanumu, 43 Watchman Way, Graduate Student  
David Levinson, MD, 2927 Folsom St., Physician  
Helen Butler, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife  
Joseph A. Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Cashier  
E. Ferry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect  
Rose Sillard, 10 Lucky St., Housewife  
John Maras, 20-12th St., Student  
Donald Brickland, 981 Shotwell St., Musician & Carpenter  
Juanita Del Carlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Hiring Hall Director  
Oscar Herrera, 360 Holyoke St., Educator  
Delmar T. Burge, 142 Central Ave., Professional Musician  
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife  
Jesse S. Valencia, 751 Castro St., Job Developer  
Peder Anthony Rivera, 57 Peters Ave., Counselor  
Fernando Cosio, 177 Johnstone Dr., Executive Director  
Miguel Quiroz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Social Worker  
Harry W. Madison, 4017 Folsom St., Appliance Repair  
Paul Sussman, 1243 Third Ave., Housing Finance  
Carmencita L. De la Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant  
Kathryn M. McCormick, 625 Scott St., Tenant Organizer  
Lynne Beuzon, 2135-28th Ave., Grants Coordinator  
Harry E. Baker, 1345 Clement St., Project Coordinator

WILLIE B. KENNEDY

My address is 950 Duncan Street  
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors  

My qualifications for office are: In my three years as Supervisor, I have worked to maintain and improve the unique quality of life we have in San Francisco—from rent control to fighting for parks and open spaces. I honor our rich diversity of cultures and life styles through support of neighborhood preservation and the rights of all groups—from children to seniors.

I initiated a campaign to control the tragic increase in child abuse; and am working hard on the problem of decreased employment, particularly for youth.

I want to continue serving your interests in making this the most liveable city in the United States.

Willie B. Kennedy

The sponsors for Willie B. Kennedy are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco  
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Elected Official, Speaker of the Assembly  
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress  
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor  
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman  
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member Community College Board  
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor/Airport Commissioner  
Al Borviso, 234 Gates St., Attorney At Law  
Harry G. Brit, 783-A Guererro St., Member, Board of Supervisors  
Agrupino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman St., Member, Board of Education  
Handy Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant, Commissioner PUC  
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco  
James C. Hornel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant  
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Union Official  
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney  
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster  
Aldo P. Lera, 1177 California St., Electrical Contractor  
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nobhill St., Philanthropist  
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor  
James McCray, 164-8th Ave., Minister  
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator  
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker  
Adolph Schuman, 1170 Sacramento St., Businessman  
Stan Smith, 15 Heart Ave., Union Official  
Yuri Wada, 565-6th Ave., U.C. Regent  
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors  
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliitas St., Minister  
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board

Statement are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES
My address is 121 Golden Gate Avenue
My occupation is Musician
My qualifications for office are: I am one of many in unity with San Francisco's diversity. I "Keyses" will open doors for you, to: homes, jobs, health care, better schools, provide more: complimentary fine arts, concerts, veterans benefits, senior services; close doors on pornography, drugs and prostitution; clean our streets and make them safe once more; eliminate wasteful spending and lower your taxes. For reasons like these, I am your "Keyses". Never again, will any San Franciscan go wanting, while "special interest" lick their fingers. Let us shine bright, the city that knows how, a guiding light to world peace now.

God help us.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys are:
Gary Gene Adams, 139-5th Ave., Plastic Fabricator
Wayne Austin, 391 Leavenworth St., Job Developer
Brian Chew, 334-30th Ave., Restaurant Worker
Ginger Coyote Coleman, 734 Bush St., Editor of Punk Globe
Hugh T. Dauley, 1177 California St., Computer Operator
Thomas A. Finney, 165 Turk St., Disabled/SSI
Howard M. Grayson, 160 Eddy St., Community Coordinator, Hosp. House
Louis J. Gwerder, 427 Valley St., Laborer
Mickey C. Helme, 777 Tehama St., Patriot
John R. Hess, 554 Broadway St., Doorman
Kevin M. Kennedy, 250 McAllister St., Social Worker
Patricia E. Kerman, 1026 Montgomery St., Film Maker
John Lyman, 149-6th St., Musician
Patrick Marsh, 231-27th St., Chef
Perry V. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Teacher
Michelle Miller, 15 Sarrey St., Student
David M. Moebus, 350 Frederick, Symphonic Musician
Keith F. Moog, 1233 Guerrero St., Controller
Gary Posner, 443 Broadway St., Engineer
Steven Present, 373 Ellis St., Security Officer
Clark Sullivan, 765 Ellis St., Political Activist
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Office/Clerical
Robin Vega, 1330 Jessie St., Courier
H. Joseph Wagner, 121 Goldengate Ave., Musician
James E. Washington, Jr. 55 Mason St., Consultant, Arts and Science
Guy West, 640 Polk St., Broadcasting
Linda Marie White, 777 Tehama St., Seamstress

DAVID L. KILBER
My address is 1901 Noriega Street
My occupation is Management Consultant
My age is 40
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of Oregon State University, a Vietnam Veteran, and a former candidate for California State Assembly. I have resided in the Sunset district with my wife Susan for five years.

I stand for a strong defense policy including the Beam Weapon anti-missile defense and the technology boom this new "Apollo" program will bring to the local economy.

San Francisco must become a center for science, classical culture, and trade, bringing blue-collar families and industry back to this city. We must expand the Port of San Francisco and launch the Pacific Basin development strategy proposed by economist Lyndon LaRouche.

David L. Kilber

The sponsors for David L. Kilber are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Holward M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Frajio, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Heart Ave., Retired
Elmora Hardy, 143 Farrellone St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Rushton St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanden Ave., Retired
David Shuyman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Voizaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
Edith Wasserskrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retired
J.G. Wasserskrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retailer

Statements are volunterred by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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QUENTIN L. KOPP
My address is 68 Country Club Drive
My occupation is Attorney/Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Local government is us, because we depend upon it to provide essential services and wise leadership. For 13 years I've fought to cut governmental waste and excessive taxation, to keep government honest and on its toes. My efforts have already saved taxpayers over $250,000,000 and I'm proud to be the one supervisor who watches how every dollar is spent. This year City government will spend an average $4,500,000 a day, every day. I want to continue my role as your "financial watchdog" in City Hall and add a needed balance to the Board. I would very much appreciate your support.

Quentin L. Kopp

The sponsors for Quentin L. Kopp are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Former Mayor
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Former Member of the Board of Supervisors
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Attorney at Law
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Businessperson
Robert C. Elkus, 469 Magellan Ave., Attorney at Law
George Evankovich, 1600-A Greenwich St., Labor Representative
Terry A. Francais, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Jack E. Frankel, 72-22nd Ave., Rabbi
Merla Zellerbach Geerner, 225 Presidio Ter., Author/Journalist
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Attorney at Law
Carleton Goodlett, 2600 O'Farrell St., Publisher
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author/Retired Publisher
Thomas E. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Gilda Kaufman, 2900 Pacific Ave., Homemaker/Volunteer
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070-26th Ave., Congressional Assistant
Joseph P. Lucey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
John Lo Schiavo, 2130 Fulton St., Priest/Educator
Haig G. Mirakian, 2960 Divisadero St., Businessman
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired President of City Employees
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Herriet C. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Self Employed Businesswoman
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Police Commissioner
Dorothy Vuskich, 177 San Alego Ave., Housewife/Volunteer
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

JULIAN LAGOS
My address is 577 Arballo Drive
My occupation is Political Scientist/Educator
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: impressive. A full decade of political activism at national, state, and local levels. Leadership roles in labor, housing, and education. To illustrate my seriousness in leading our City, I have launched the following initiative campaigns:
* A 3-year rent freeze
* Commercial rent control
* A balanced budget
* Expedition of labor disputes
* Driver-ownership of taxicabs
* An outdoor stadium in front of Moscone Center
As your supervisor, I will pursue:
* District elections for district councils
* Metro services for the Richmond, Marina, Bayview
* Higher police standards
* More schools and parks
You need me now, San Francisco! Who else you gonna call?

Julian O. Lagos

The sponsors for Julian Lagos are:
Charles Martin Adams, 54 4th St., Cab Driver
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 577 Arballo Dr., Psychologist
Elizabeth Alvarez, 1262 La Playa St., Sales
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall St., Computer Consultant
Elizabeth Benford, 508 Andover St., Attorney
Katherine Borsowski, 417 Stockton St., Unemployed
Thomas J. Callan, 17 Sutro Heights Blvd., Consultant
James D. Cantor, 742 Treat Ave., Station Attendant
Henry Consava, 1258 40th Ave., Professor
Leon Datangel, 725 Van Ness Ave., Businessman
Peggy L. Dickson, 520 Montecito, Student
Mark Emery, 555 Taylor St., Artist
James Michael Faye, 1369-B Page St., Tenant Advocate
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore St., Videographer
Ken Johnson, 42 Kelloch St., Cabdriver
Vincent B. Latimer, 4118-A 24th St., Service Manager
Richard Loewinsohn, 1341 Valencia St., Writer
John B. Loretz, 905 Columbus Ave., Cab Driver/Fisherman
Berniece Martin, 506 Church St., Public Stenographer
Jonathan Mc Curdy, 80 Alvarado St., Attorney
Victor E. Miller, 1341 Valenca St., Editor
Steven A. Schechter, 1301 20th St., Attorney
William F. Taylor, 1890 Clay St., Operating Engineer
Frank S. Warner, 2530 Fillmore St., Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 249 Cotter St., Legal Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JULIANNE MALVEAUX

My address is 26 Winfield Street
My occupation is Economics Professor/Labor Specialist/Writer
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan and former White House staffer (1977-78) Dr. Julianne Malveaux (pronounced “Mal-Voh”) is an elected California State Central Committeewoman who is committed to a diverse San Francisco:
—San Francisco Tomorrow Board Member
—Booker T. Washington/Ella Hill Hutch Board Member
—Strong Supporter: Mondale-Ferraro
—Steering Committee, San Francisco Plat Initiative
—Delegate candidate for Jesse Jackson
—Former staff, President’s Council of Economic Advisors
—Ph.D. (Economics, MIT)
—Co-author of three books
—Columnist, San Francisco Sun Reporter
—Priority focus: job creation programs for youth, minorities, and women
—Author, 1984 Ballot Proposition J which prohibits San Francisco pension fund investments in South Africa.

The sponsors for Julianne Malveaux are:
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
Judith Brecka, 609 Kansas St., Lawyer, City Commissioner
Randall Bronner, 1390 Market St., Artist/Musician
Rene Caen, 2621-22nd St., Housing Advocate
Terence Faulkner, 277-42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Thomas C. Fleming, 2171 O’Farrell St., Journalist
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Margaret A. Gannon, 3649-18th St., Attorney
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Yvonne S. Golden, 1743-9th Ave., School Administrator
Peter M. Good, 709 Shafter St., Arborist
Roberto Y. Hernandez, 825 Moultrie St., Director, Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer
Doris W. Kahn, 3259 Clay St., Transportation Commissioner
Tory Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Michael Koblentz, 825 Masonic Ave., Distributor
Orelia Langston, 55 Friendship Way, Senior and Geriatric Specialist
Arthur Lathan, 2350-48th Ave., Personnel Administrator
Michael C. Miller, 1920 Quint St., Attorney
Jack D. Morrison, 4 Woodland Ave., Management consultant
Carl Diao Reece, 2034-46th Ave., Graduate Student
Ruth Jordan Schnapp, 726-23rd Ave., Structural Engineer
Frances M. Shaskan, 259-32nd Ave., Consumer Rights Advocate
Anita Silvera, 15 Otsego St., Professor, S.F. State
Arlo Smith, 66 Fernando Way, District Attorney
Bruce M. St.Cyr, 343 Chester Ave., Vice President AFSCME
Local 2620
Ida V. Strickland, 1664 Fulton St., Administrator
Calvin Welch, 519 Ashbury St., Community Consultant

JOHN L. MOLINARI

My address is 30 16th Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: To make San Francisco work takes both good ideas and cooperation with everyone.

For over 12 years as your Supervisor, my contribution has been to bring together both the diverse viewpoints of San Francisco’s many communities and the other Supervisors to solve our City’s problems. With your support, I’ve:
—Promoted the construction of more housing; limited condominium conversions to protect renters; protected tenants from rent gougers and outrageous security deposits;
—Initiated escort services to protect seniors;
—Initiated preferential parking and parking ticket amnesty programs;
—Protected our neighborhood character from big companies forcing out small merchants; and
—Protected San Francisco’s parks and playgrounds.

The sponsors for John L. Molinari are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Arlo Smith, 66 San Francisco Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
John Francis Foran, 900 Rockdale Dr., State Senator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Louise K. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Homemaker/Media Producer
Rev. Anor C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Member, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Pastor
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director, Patient Advocacy
Gordon J. Lau, 540 19th Ave., Member, Port Commission
Yuri Wada, 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Alan S. Wong, 1208 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Duke J. Armstrong, 352 Divisadero St., Former President, C.R.I.R.
Paul Boneberg, 647-A Castro St., President, Stonewall Gay Political Club
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, Community United Against Violence
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter (B.A.R.)
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Member, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Political Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington Way, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Political Club
Maureen J. Conroy, 650 Eucalyptus Dr., Homemaker
John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Chair, Sierra Club Bay Chapter
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Sunset District Merchant

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Senior Health Care Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I am a political progressive with extensive professional experience as an administrator, program consultant, mediator, and service provider. These skills and my perspective will be valuable additions to the Board.

My commitment to economic and social justice is backed by 25 years of community service to ethnic and cultural minorities, women, low- and moderate-income families, elders, youths, gay people, small businesses, workers, the disabled, and government policy-makers.

I support neighborhood preservation, affordable housing measures (including rent control), jobs and job training for San Franciscans, comparable worth, and environmental safeguards.

I am a parent and San Francisco homeowner.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:
Priscilla Alexander, 745 Haight St., Feminist Activist
Zohn F. Artman, 141 Albion St., Media Consultant
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Executive Director, SF Renaissance
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-59th Ave., Data Processing Manager
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, CUA
Dennis M. Collins, 145-27th St., Political Consultant
Greg Day, 2260 Market St., Youth Services Director
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Attorney/Teacher
Walter R. Ems, 188 Eureka St., Retired
Lawrence V. Epinette, 765 Geneva Ave., Confidential Secretary
Roma Guy, 583 Missouri St., Co-Director, The Women's Foundation
Kenneth W. Jones, 600 Fillmore St., Office Manager; SF AIDS Foundation
Linda Jupiter, 2768-22nd St., Book Production Manager
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Senior Services Administration
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant, S.F. Sheriff's Department
Juanita Owens, 371 Coleridge St., Educator/Administrator
Tish A. Pearlman, 464 Duboce Ave., Writer/Photographer
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Political Activist
Sal Roselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Union Business Representative
Marguerite Rubenstein, 46 Stillings Ave., Therapist
Stephen H. Walters, 1223 Diamond St., Fundraiser

JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS

My address is 1203 Clayton Street
My occupation is Executor (Probate Attorney)
My qualifications for office are: This is not New York. My grandfather worked for this city for thirty-six years; helping to make San Francisco the greatest place on earth in which to live. Now our city bus system has to go hat in hand to Los Angeles to borrow buses. The quality of care at our general hospital has come under extreme question. The city of love, tolerance, and understanding is becoming more and more divided by every hate on earth. I, as a fourth generation San Franciscan, call upon you to join with us natives in the fight to keep San Francisco San Francisco.

Joseph James Phillips

The Sponsors for Joseph J. Phillips are:
Margaret Moskovitz Berzin, 2201 Lake St., Retired
Ernest Lottl, 979 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
Amelia Sheehan, 436-27th Ave., Homemaker
Salvador Garza, 795 Brunswick St., Businessman
Gerald E. Gallagher, 2262-34th Ave., Retired
Jean M. McDermott, 325-9th Ave., Tax Preparer
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Juanita G. Cardellini, 1215-18th St., Retired
Peter G. Economou, 2040 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Laura Lottl, 979 Avalon Ave., Volunteer for Handicapped
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Consuelo G. MacDonald, 801-44th Ave., Retired
Roger Boschetti, 20 Carmelian St., Television Producer
Jody S. Hirota, 571-19th Ave., Dental Hygienist
Maurice C. Bihan, 111 Willard North St., Salesman
Kelly Lyon, 435-25th Ave., Secretary
Ralph A. Barsi, 1236 Athens St., Retired Teamster
Laura B. Campbell, 1275-32nd Ave., NOW
William E. Beyers, Jr., 3252 Geary Blvd., Printer
Pearle Wong, 1555 Shadrer St., Housewife
Sophia E. Conley, 2845 Cabrillo St., Teacher
Jimmy Starr, 23 Boardman Pl., Lawyer
Hannah Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
John L. Santiago, 150 Woodland Ave., Retired
Walter J. Murphy, 767 Corbett Ave., Retired
Carl H. Hoppe, 100 Hamilton St., Retired
Jack L Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
Sam Keilsteine, 84 Lopez Ave., Self Employed
Helen Marie Sheehan, 875-38th Ave., Housewife
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LOUISE RENNE

My address is 3725 Jackson Street
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: As Finance Committee chairperson I have protected vital services while cutting wasteful expenditures. Sound policies have been implemented. San Francisco is on solid financial footing.
At the same time I played a leadership role in legislation affecting the environment, health care, Muni, the arts, indeed all San Franciscans (including our seniors and children).
My prior experience includes Deputy Attorney General, Criminal and Environmental Units; argued cases in Supreme Court; President, California Women Lawyers.
As an effective Supervisor, I pledge to continue my hard work, to act responsibly and compassionately, and to speak honestly on the critical issues affecting all San Franciscans.

Louise Renne

The sponsors for Louise Renne are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman 16th District
Bernard Avertucha, 59 Rivoli St., Public Relations
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director—CYO—Urban Development
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Pres. Airport Commission
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrar St., Planning Commissioner
Harry G. Britt, 783A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rev. Ames C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Thomas J. Cahill, 246-17th Ave., Chief of Police, Retired
Lilly Cuneo, 3519 Jackson St., Housewife
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Anne W. Halsted, 1506 Montgomery St., Vice President, Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Vice President, ILGWU
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman/Commissioner
John S. Jennings, 2743 San Bruno Ave., Realtor (Ret.)
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director of ILWU
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
Leslie M. Lawrence, 2423 Broadway, Certified Public Accountant
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner and Attorney
Melvin D. Lee, 450-22nd Ave., Engineer (Commissioner, S.F. Redevelopment Agency)
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Cyril Magnin, One Nob Hill Cir., Philanthropist
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor, State of California
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women’s Political Caucus of San Francisco
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Business Representative
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Investment Advisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, SF Board of Supervisors
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CAROL RUTH SILVER

My address is 68 Ramona Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: Experience: Seven years a San Francisco Supervisor; twenty years a practicing attorney; mother of two.
—Responsiveness to neighborhoods:
My parking reform legislation will open up neighborhood parking spaces.
My fire and smoke detector legislation will make our whole City more safe.
—Advocate for fairness legislation:
—preserving sunlight in parks
—outlawing gay discrimination
—creating low and moderate income housing
—repairing City streets and buildings
—rent control
—protecting Chinatown merchants
—S.A.F.E. and Senior Escort Programs
—Neighborhood Arts Programs
—reducing smog
—preserving San Francisco Bay
—expanding Muni
—wheelchair accessibility
—more women and minorities receiving City contracts
—child care
I will continue to insist on fairness.

Carol Ruth Silver

The Sponsors for Carol Ruth Silver are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Jeff Brown, 850-41st Ave., Public Defender
George Agnos, 2131 Funston Ave., City Attorney
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., San Francisco Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Bryerick St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., San Francisco Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., San Francisco Supervisor
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, President, Airport Commission
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Utilities Commissioner
Emmett D. Condon, 2506-21st Ave.
Yuri Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Julie C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Tim M. Dayonot, 645 Randolph St., Charity Media Specialist
Teresa E. Griffin, 839-41st Ave., Retired Teacher
Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired
Samuel Jordan, 4006-3rd St., Caterer
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Civil Engineer
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Education
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Realtor
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Business Representative
Jack Trujillo, 74 Ramona St., Word Processor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Senior Health Care Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I am a political progressive with extensive professional experience as an administrator, program consultant, mediator, and service provider. These skills and my perspective will be valuable additions to the Board.

My commitment to economic and social justice is backed by 25 years of community service to ethnic and cultural minorities, women, low- and moderate-income families, elders, youths, gay people, small businesses, workers, the disabled, and government policy-makers.

I support neighborhood preservation, affordable housing measures (including rent control), jobs and job training for San Franciscans, comparable worth, and environmental safeguards.

I am a parent and San Francisco homeowner.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:
Priscilla Alexander, 745 Haight St., Feminist Activist
Zohn F. Artman, 141 Albion St., Media Consultant
Michael Bernick, 376 Goldengate Ave., Executive Director, SF Renaissance
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing Manager
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, CUAV
Dennis M. Collins, 145-27th St., Political Consultant
Greg Day, 2200 Market St., Youth Services Director
Mary C. Dunlap, 426 Staples Ave., Attorney/Teacher
Walter R. Ems, 188 Eureka St., Retired
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 765 Geneva Ave., Confidential Secretary
Roma Guy, 583 Missouri St., Co-Director, The Women's Foundation
Kenneth W. Jones, 600 Fillmore St., Office Manager; SF AIDS Foundation
Linda Jupiter, 2786-22nd St., Book Production Manager
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Senior Services Administration
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Editor
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Jane McKillie Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant, S.F. Sheriff's Department
Juanita Owens, 371 Coleridge St., Educator/Administrator
Tish A. Peardman, 464 Duboce Ave., Writer/Photographer
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Political Activist
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Union Business Representative
Marguerite Rubenstein, 46 Ststillings Ave., Therapist
Stephen H. Walters, 1223 Diamond St., Fundraiser

JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS

My address is 1203 Clayton Street
My occupation is Executor (Probate Attorney)
My qualifications for office are: This is not New York.
My grandfather worked for this city for thirty-six years; helping to make San Francisco the greatest place on earth in which to live. Now our city bus system has to go hat in hand to Los Angeles to borrow buses. The quality of care at our general hospital has come under extreme question. The city of love, tolerance, and understanding is becoming more and more divided by every hate on earth. I, as a fourth generation San Franciscan, call upon you to join with us natives in the fight to keep San Francisco San Francisco.

Joseph James Phillips

The Sponsors for Joseph J. Phillips are:
Margaret Moskovitz Berzin, 2201 Lake St., Retired
Ernest Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
Amelia Sheehan, 436-27th Ave., Homemaker
Salvador Garza, 795 Brunswick St., Businessman
Gerald E. Gallagher, 2282-34th Ave., Retired
Jean M. McDermott, 352-9th Ave., Tax Preparer
A. John Shimon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Juanita G Cardinelli, 1215-18th St., Retired
Peter G. Economou, 2040 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Laura Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Volunteer for Handicapped
Lee S. Dolton, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Consuelo G. MacDonald, 801-44th Ave., Retired
Roger Boschetti, 20 Cernelian St., Television Producer
Jody S. Hiroti, 377-19th Ave., Dental Hygienist
Maurice C. Bihan, 112 Willard North St., Salesman
Kelly Lyon, 452-25th Ave., Secretary
Ralph A. Bani, 1236 Athens St., Retired Teamster
Laura B. Campbell, 1275-32nd Ave., NOW
William E. Beyers, Jr, 3222 Geary Blvd, Printer
Pearle Wong, 1555 Shrader St., Housewife
Sophia E. Conley, 2845 Cabrillo St., Teacher
Jimmy Sturr, 23 Boardman Pl., Lawyer
Hannah Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
John L. Santiago, 150 Woodland Ave., Retired
Walter J. Murphy, 767 Corbett Ave., Retired
Carl H. Hoppe, 100 Hamilton St., Retired
Jack I Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
Sam Kelkstein, 84 Lopez Ave., Self Employed
Helen Marie Sheehan, 875-38th Ave., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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LOUISE RENNE

My address is 3725 Jackson Street
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
My age is 47

My qualifications for office are: As Finance Committee chairperson I have protected vital services while cutting wasteful expenditures. Sound policies have been implemented. San Francisco is on solid financial footing.

At the same time I played a leadership role in legislation affecting the environment, health care, Muni, the arts, indeed all San Franciscans (including our seniors and children).

My prior experience includes Deputy Attorney General, Criminal and Environmental Units; argued cases in Supreme Court; President, California Women Lawyers.

As an effective Supervisor, I pledge to continue my hard work, to act responsibly and compassionately, and to speak honestly on the critical issues affecting all San Franciscans.

Louise Renne

The sponsors for Louise Renne are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman 16th District
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli St., Public Relations
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director—CYO—Urban Development
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Pres. Airport Commission
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrade St., Planning Commissioner
Harry G. Britt, 783A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Thomas J. Cahill, 246-17th Ave., Chief of Police, Retired
Lily Cuneo, 3819 Jackson St., Housewife
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President, Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Maggie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Vice President, ILGWU
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman/Commissioner
John S. Jennings, 2745 San Bruno Ave., Realtor (Ret.)
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director of ILWU
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
Leslie M. Lawrence, 2423 Broadway, Certified Public Accountant
Louis Hopp Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner and Attorney
Melvin D. Lee, 450-22nd Ave., Engineer (Commissioner, S.F. Redevelopment Agency)
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Cyril Magnus, 1 Nob Hill Cir., Philanthropist
Leo McCarthy, 404 Megellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor, State of California
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Business Representative
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Investment Advisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, SF Board of Supervisors
Harold T. Yee, 1208 Ellis St., Economist

CAROL RUTH SILVER

My address is 68 Ramona Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: Experience: Seven years a San Francisco Supervisor; twenty years a practicing attorney; mother of two.

—Responsiveness to neighborhoods:
  My parking reform legislation will open up neighborhood parking spaces.

  My fire and smoke detector legislation will make our whole City more safe.

—Advocate for fairness legislation:
  —preserving sunlight in parks
  —outlawing gay discrimination
  —creating low and moderate income housing
  —repairing City streets and buildings
  —rent control
  —protecting Chinatown merchants
  —S.A.F.E. and Senior Escort Programs

—Neighborhood Arts Programs

—reducing smog

—preserving San Francisco Bay
—expanding Muni
—wheelchair accessibility
—more women and minorities receiving City contracts
—child care

I will, continue to insist on fairness.

Carol Ruth Silver

The Sponsors for Carol Ruth Silver are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Cyril Magnus, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
George Agnost, 2131 Funston Ave., City Attorney
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., San Francisco Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Bill Maier, 69 Elsie St., San Francisco Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., San Francisco Supervisor
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Community College Board
Merris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, President, Airport Commission
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Utilities Commissioner
Emmett D. Condon, 2506-21st Ave.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Tim M. Daynoot, 645 Randolph St., Charity Media Specialist
Teresa E. Griffin, 839-41st Ave., Retired Teacher
Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired
Samuel Jordan, 400-3rd St., Caterer
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Civil Engineer
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Arthur/Education
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Serrano Way, Attorney
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Realtor
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Business Representative
Jack Trojillo, 74 Ramona St., Word Processor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DAVID C. SMITH
My address is 2567 Alemany Blvd
My occupation is Administrator, Service Agency
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: I am a San Francisco State graduate in journalism, married, with a deep affection for this place. For seven years my wife and I have counseled families and individuals from every neighborhood in San Francisco—an investment and commitment to the future. Dealing with these problems has increased my awareness of this city’s growing preoccupation with rights and shrinking concern for responsibilities. The solution includes a return to basics, to strong family units, to solid values, to the worth of all human life. I will be a voice for those who feel excluded, especially exploited children and the disadvantaged.

David C. Smith

The sponsors for David C. Smith are:
James Bailey, Sr., 422 Guerrero St., Minister
Lillian P. Bailey, 422 Guerrero St., Housewife
Janis Ann Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Secretary
Jeffrey Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Photographer
Robert R. Carlson, 337 Baden St., Radio Producer
Victoria A. Carlyle, 1808 Octavia St., Political Analyst
John William Castro, 3 Plymouth St., Mover
John Frederick Decker, 1090 Eddy St., Designer
Frances Edwards, 2554 Alemany Blvd., Housewife
Daisy Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., Homemaker
David Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., High School President
James W. Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Police Officer
Jean Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Housewife
James L. Higgs, 270 Juanita Way, Pastor
Margaret M. Lee, 730-12th Ave., Secretary
Mark W. Lee, 881 Silver Ave., President, Simpson College
Arvid Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Norma Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Secretary
Philip Litton, 3340 San Bruno Ave., Student
John A. McGeehan, 1220 LaPlaya St., Military, U.S. Army
Charles A. Mckinney, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
J. Thad McKinney, 766 Kansas St., Station Manager
Marilyn G. Miller, 518 Dewey Blvd., Secretary
Chris Montgomery, 518 Dewey Blvd., Church Worker
Lawrence W. Pong, 254 Arch St., Environmental Health Inspector
James Douglas Robinson, 1310-7th Ave., Mowing Company Manager
James W. Robinson, 518 Dewey Blvd., Executive Director of a Christian Service Organization
Conrad R. Sanchez, 1808 Octavia St., Restaurateur
Constance B. Steinbach, 180 Lipperd Ave., Homemaker

KEVIN STARR
My address is 445 Chestnut Street
My occupation is Businessman, Communicator, Professor
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Born in San Francisco, I relish the past, present and future of this great city. I know it from a variety of perspectives—as executive aide to Mayor Alioto, as City Librarian, as a newspaper columnist, as a professor, as a businessman, and as a person active in many civic causes. I now wish to bring my talents and experience to the Board of Supervisors. I believe I can be of unique service as the centrist advocate of this city as it looks to its future. That future, the well-being of each of us, will be my greatest concern.

Kevin Starr

The sponsors for Kevin Starr are:
Richard B. Allen, 2111 Franklin St., Merchant
Lynn A. Altshuler, 1490 Sacramento St., Attorney
Thomas E. Anderson, 226 Moncada Way, Clergyman
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Job Training Director
Gino Birdelli, 700 Columbus Ave., Restaurateur
Sam Cambi, 265 San Anselmo Ave., Insurance Estate Planner
Frank J. Caufield, 1034 Chestnut St., Venture Capital Investor
Violet L. Chu, 1282 Vallejo St., Asian Art Commissioner
Elizabeth A. Cooley, 2820 Scott St., Legal Assistant
Paul Denning, 2165 California St., Investment Banker
Martin Eng, 665 Fine St., County Central Committee Member
James W. Haas, 163 Prospect Ave., Attorney
Patrick E. Hallinan, 117-27th Ave., Attorney
Walter E. Hoadley, 999 Green St., Economist
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Allan S. Johnson, 163 Prospect Ave., Consultant
Dorrwin Buck Jones, 245 Northpoint St., Gerontologist; Director, Meals on Wheels
Harold K. Lipset, 2509 Pacific Ave., Private Investigator
Frances A. Lopez, 1474 Sacramento St., Paralegal
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Editor
John Maher, 795-8th Ave., Executive
Roxanne Mankin, 2512 Pacific Ave., Investment Real Estate
Michael Marston, 3375 Jackson St., Real Estate and Development Consultant
Larry Mazzola, 300-24th Ave., Asst. Business Manager, Local #38
John N. Rosekrans, Jr., 2840 Broadway , Businessman, Toy Manufacturer
Michael S. Salarino, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Businessman
Michael Strunks, 2266 Bay St., Construction Executive
Brooks Walker, Jr., 2930 Broadway, Business Executive
Suzan Yee, 632-6th Ave., Attorney

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
JOHN E. WAHL
My address is 118C Connecticut Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have a 20 year record of voluntary, unpaid public service to San Francisco. I have worked with all levels of City government, with people in all parts of the City. Examples of my public service include being a Judge Pro Tem of the San Francisco Municipal Court, 9 years of service on the Board of the San Francisco Council of Churches, service on the Pride Foundation Board, and service to veterans.
I am dedicated to ensuring affordable places to live, a responsible and unprejudiced police department, decent jobs, and dependable transportation.
I am independent of special interest club politics.

John E. Wahl

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN
My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is Staff-writer for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 58
My qualifications for office are: My program:
Courts, cops and strikebreaking injunctions; two-gate, two-tiered, union-busting tactics, are helping employers depress living standards. Escalating health, housing and food costs are forcing working people—especially Blacks and Latinos—out of San Francisco. Corporate condos and highrises replace workers' residences.

Door-key children of working parents, denied childcare, are left to roam the streets. Abortion clinics are under siege.

Only united labor—employed, unemployed, black, white—can change this condition. An independent labor party, based on the unions, must be built to replace the callous politicians of the two ruling capitalist parties.

Jobs not war!

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for John F. Wahl are:
Enola D. Maxwell, 1539 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
John Riordan, 1425 Willard St., Vice President, Community College Board
Carolene W. Marks, 55 Jordan Ave., Economist and Civic Leader
James E. Sandmire, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
E. Patricia (Pat) Lucey, 69 Huntington Dr., Attorney
Benjamin L. Marcus, 84 Winfield St., Rabbi and Chaplain
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Walter W. Grumm, 3126-22nd St., Clegyperson
Ann Marie Day, 126 Delmar St., Retired Social Worker
Cleve Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Aide
Paul S. Yein, 342-8th Ave., Real Estate Agent
Hank Wilson, 1651 Market St., Hotel Operator
Fred L. Kuriander, 115 San Jose, Attorney
Jean Wall Burgess, 421 Moraga Ave., Lawyer
Gary E. Myerscough, 156 Sproule Ln., Education Administrator
Paula F. Lichtenberg, 952 Jones St., Paralegal
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author, Retired Publisher
Jerry G. Guerra, 85 Fortuna St., Retailer
Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr., M.D. 2170 Hayes St., Physician
Foster W. Weeks, 1910 Greenwich St., Advertising Consultant
Shirley Kaiser, 806-53rd Ave., Teacher
Robert W. Shorr, 146 Guerrero St., Businessman
Rosa M. Kwong, 512 Van Ness Ave., Law Student
Charlene Yamato, 416 Font Blvd., Secretary
Jeanette Sitkowsky, 75 Woodhaven Ct., Classroom Teacher
Alan Thompson Smith, 190 Palo Alto Ave., Small Business Owner
William Earl Andrews, 4130 Army St., Taxi Driver
Larry E. Hughes, 87 Fortuna St., Paralegal/Consultant
Julita V. DeChavez, 1591-45th Ave., Deputy County Clerk

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:
Alan A. Benjamin, 2783-20th St., Editor, Socialist Action
Paul Colvin, 559-36th Ave., Printer
Nancy G. Eliner, 615 Central Ave., Teacher
Ralph P. Forsyth, 77 Cedro St., Teacher
May May Gong, 25 Bessie St., Power Plant Operator
Nancy L. Gruber, 921 Alvardo St., Editor
Millie B. Gonzalez, 2543-32nd Ave., Student
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Longshoreman
Ruth Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Office Worker
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297-18th St., Retail Clerk
William G. Leuner, 335 Day St., Mechanic
Ann Menasche, 2149-48th Ave., Feminist Attorney
Linda I. Ray, 3740-25th St., Registered Nurse
Ana A. Robertson, 553 Day St., Professor
Joseph M. Ryan, 25 Bessie St., Machinist
Karen A. Schieve, 3575-19th St., Sales Clerk
Michael William Schreiber, 3593 Mission St., Muni Driver
Carole Seligman, 245 Whitney St., Muni Bus Driver
Kathryn Selman, 1341-16th Ave., Engineer
Margery Jean VanDerslice, 1540-20th St., Registered Nurse
Christine Vaughn, 1253 Polk St., Poster or Clerk
David Walters, 2543-32nd Ave., Power Plant Operator
Bonnie Weinstein, 1716 Revere Ave., Student
Deborah Weinstein, 1830 Church St., Unemployed Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 489-27th St., Painter

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DAVE WHARTON

My address is 5031 Diamond Heights Blvd.
My occupation is Community Service Attorney
My age is 44


It's time for housing expansion, for transit, traffic, parking overhaul. Time for better City services, especially for seniors and youth. Time to strengthen economy, create jobs, control taxes. Time for neighborhood revitalization, parking relief. Time for human rights advancement, efficient and humane police services. Experiment with Board meetings in neighborhoods.

It's time for goals, results, citizen participation. San Francisco is world class city, small town; lose either, be neither. I build bridges, not barriers. Join our common sense coalition.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:

Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Libby Denebom, 200 St Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Attorney/Rent Board Commissioner
Jerry E. Berg, 53 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Russell Flynn, 2815 Pacific Ave., Real Estate/Rent Board Commissioner
Charles B. Renfrew, 791-14th Ave., Attorney/Former Federal Judge
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Hotel/Real Estate Executive
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Alicia Wang, 1418 Leavenworth St., Educational Specialist
Mortimer Fleischhacker, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Investor
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
Diane C. Kefauver, 1726 Great Highway, Consultant
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Union President/Retired
Jose Gomez, 39 Grandview Ave., Legal Services/Executive Director
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
John L. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Insurance/Savings and Loan Chairman
Phyllis Kern, 306 Arbor St., Labor Union Secretary
Russell I. Kassman, 2454 Bush St., Businessman
Laura E. McBride, 925 Cole St., Typographer
George M. Raya, 90 Verna Ct., City Employee
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Development Executive
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Agent
Lawrence A. Wilson, 333-A Pierce St., Attorney—Community Volunteer
Deborah R. Pines, 4248-20th St., Financial Consultant
John T. McAllister, Jr, 999 Green St., Businessman
Bobbie Griffith, 30 Leland Ave., District Attorney Investigator
Edith Wellin, 165-A Alpine Ter., Teacher

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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**DICK CERBATOS**

My address is 471 Hoffman Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have always been deeply interested in the education of youth. Before my appointment to the Board of Education two years ago, I served twenty years on Citizens' Advisory and PTA committees focusing on education. As an engineer business-owner, I also bring professional skills to the Board.
As a first generation American, I am sympathetic to minority children's problems, and aware that public education is the golden gateway to opportunity and success.
I intend to continue pressing for higher test scores, improved discipline and morale, less truancy, and an increase in college admissions.
I am committed to excellence in education.

A. Richard Cerbatos

The sponsors for Dick Cerbatos are:

- Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
- Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly
- Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
- Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
- Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-29th St., Member, Community College Board
- A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Lawyer
- Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
- Al Borzica, 234 Gates St., Attorney at Law
- Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
- Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director
- Judy Dellamonicia, 3323 Taraval St., President, San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
- Jana Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
- Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President-Personnel
- Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
- Eugene S. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Physician
- Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
- Ralph F. Hurtado, 65 Newburg St., Executive Director
- Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Labor-Vice President, ILGWU
- Leroy King, 75 Sampa Ln., Reg. Dir. ILWU
- Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
- Bette Wallace Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
- Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
- Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Cir., Homemaker
- Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
- Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
- Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
- Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, S.F. Board of
- Supervisors
- A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilarius St., Minister
- Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
- Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

**CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON**

My address is 29 Oliver Street
My occupation is Transit Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I was born and raised in San Francisco, graduating from Balboa High.
For the past 7 years I have been active in the school district having been elected to 2 terms on the District Advisory Committee, 4 years as the chairperson of the Pelton Academic Middle School Parent's Group, and 5 years on the site advisory council at Pelton.
I am married and have 2 children attending Commodore Sloat Elementary School.
I believe there is much work needed to provide the quality education our children need to prepare them for a highly technical society of computers and robotics.

Chris Christenson

The sponsors for Christopher Christenson are:

- Essie L. Webb, 186 Maddux Ave., Intake & Referral Specialist
- Raymond Tuscott, 515 John Muir Dr., Deputy Sheriff
- Frits Smyth, 1709-16th Ave., Deputy Sheriff
- Harry E. Jensen, III, 74 Delmonte St., Electrical Transit Manager
- Joe W. Turner, 1274 Palou Ave., Janitor Supervisor II
- Martin Larkin, 4733 Lincoln Way, Paint Supervisor
- James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Supervisor II
- Joseph Dela Rosa, 50 Oliver St., Seaman
- Precious Moore, 2046 Thomas Ave., Home Health Aide
- Liana Sand Dune Kastina, 524 Clipper St., Clerk Typist
- William Satchell, 500 Francisco St., Transit Car Cleaner
- Roy W. Haver, 576 Lisbon St., Marble Shopman
- Guadalupe Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Housewife
- Jeanne L. Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Grocery Clerk
- Roosevelt Lancaster, 170 Ledyard St., Transit Car Cleaner
- Lena M. Quinains, 3331 Hearst Ave., Housewife
- Alfred Lent, 1475 Church St., Electrical Mechanic
- George Williams, Sr., 335 Hearst Ave., Retired
- Beatrice L. Dunbar, 430 Thornton Ave., Retired
- Vicente Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Driver
- Gabriela, R. Wilkerson, 1347-13th Ave., Cashier

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
My address is 200 St. Francis Blvd.
My occupation is Incumbent School Board Member
My qualifications for office are: Four years ago you elected me to the school board. I am deeply grateful.
I have worked hard. Student achievement scores improved, enrollment stabilized. We strengthened significantly special programs and alternative schools.
There remains much work to do. As a mother of six public school educated children, former teacher and experienced school board member, I know how our schools should work.
Many children today will finish school in the 21st Century. For all our children we must plan for the future, reaffirm our commitment to excellence, use school dollars prudently and ensure the momentum for improvement in our schools continues.

Libby Denebein

The sponsors for Libby Denebein are:
Robert S. Denebein, 800 St Francis Blvd., Businessman
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 785 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Sala Burton, 801 Church Blvd., Congresswoman
William K. Colditz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Patricia F. Costello, 2838 Green St., Community Leader
Carroll T. del Portillo, 54 Berkeley Way, Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Zurielli L. Closey, 259 Maywood Dr., BPA
Michael Hemmessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA Volunteer
Richard D. Houglit, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortez St., Police Commissioner
Cynthia Brown Kelly, 460 Magellan St., Homemaker
Mynn G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., Board of Education Member
Nath Aswani Latur, 1116 Custo St., Sculptor
Jordan L. Lai, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Leo T. McCarthy, 460 Magellan St., Lt. Governor
Peter Mecey, 3528 Clay St., Attorney/Businessman
Carole Migdol, 560-28th St., Mental Health Director
John L. Molinari, 30-4th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nader, 150 Castile Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
Philip Bruce Radul, 952 Clayson St., SP Open Space Committee
Member
Sal Russell, 349 Lexington St., Labor/Gay Leader
Joan Marie Shelley, 853 Burnett Ave., Teacher/President, SP Federation of Teachers
Arlo Smith, 80 San Francisco Way, District Attorney
Yuri Wada, 560-4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Pauly Poulo Valley, 469 San Jose Ave., Contract Compliance Representative
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Malcolm S. Watts, 570 Collis Ave., Physician

GEORGE DUKSTRA

My address is 949 Filbert Street
My occupation is Community Services Director
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am trained in government finance and Citizen Participation decision making. Long community involvement includes director, Educational Services, Executive Board of Golden Gate Child Development, Saint Mary's Hospital Board and Yick Wo Elementary Parent's Committee. My education includes a B.A., emphasizing Education and U.S.C. graduate school.
I am practical, experienced and positive. I expect more from students, parents and teachers. I promise fiscal responsibility. I respect and support parent participation, teacher professionalism and every student's right to learn in well-equipped, orderly schools. Opportunity, Technology and Basics.
Vote for me! I will keep children in the picture.

George Dukstra

The sponsors for George Dukstra are:
Lisa Bardaro, M.D., 880 St. Frank Blvd., Physician
Mihleent Buxton, 50 Panama Ave., Educator
Robert T. Corrado, 18 Miranda Ave., Administrator
Teresa M. D'Aurato, 76 Henning St., Environmental Fund Raising
Kathleen Deftola, 949 Filbert St., Psychologist
Kathleen Dykstra, 949 Filbert St., Legal Administrator
Linda J. Giszczak, 86-86th Ave., Director of Medical Records
Terence Hailman, 51 Graham St., Attorney-at-Law
Ann K. Hillesdon, 304 Carillion Ave., Volunteer Coordinator
D. S. Inaba, 44 Escobedo Ave., Associate Professor
Martha Anne Jessup, 2602 Diamond St., Educator
Deborah L. Keller, 1440-41 Ave., Student
Sarhanus Lumbert, 63 Winterfield St., Women's Services Consultant
Kimm Lundy, 1040 Cole St., Student
Nick Lederer, 79 Mission St., Executive Director, Senior Services
Dr. Thomas S. McCoy, 144 Clay St., Professor
Tom J. Moss, M.D., St. Mary's Conv., AIDS Clinician-Researcher
Susan L. Krug, 1325-32th Ave., Accountant
Marcia Quackenbush, 1600-27th Ave., Social Worker
Shirlley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director
CAHRED

Mervyn A. Silverman, 110 Frederick St., Director of Health
Kenneth M. Sims, 1454 Palou Ave., Associate Director Child Development Center
David S. Smith, 50 Panama Ave., Physician
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Monocello St., Attorney
Michael Stepman, 2100 Baker St., Attorney
Harvey W. Q. Hs., 70 Lomita Ave., Businessman
Nancy C. Walker, 355 Green St., Student, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, of Rutherford, Methodist Minister
L. Lee Zerkin, 1326-26th Ave., Editor

Statements are voluntarily submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Candidates for School Board

MARTIN ENG
My address is 665 Pine Street
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant
My qualifications for office are: Twelve years of community and civic service.

Issues
Eng supports:
• Our children's inherent right for education.
• Regain respect for our teachers.
• Strict measures to halt school violence. Stop the sale and use of street drugs.
• Higher standards for teachers and students.
• Encourage teachers and parents participation within the Board.
• Merit pay to outstanding teachers.
Maximize income: Lease surplus school properties. End mismanagement by incompetent Board members.

Eng opposes:
• Current programs teaching alternative lifestyle to our precious children. A violation of the First Amendment.
• Board members extravagant dinner meetings with liquor paid for by taxpayers. A blatant violation of the law.

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:
John Barbogela, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Real Estate Broker, Former Supervisor
John Kiordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Commissioner, Contractors
Lee S. Dolson, 1753 Beach St., Professor, Former Supervisor
Dr. John B. Tsu, 2 Denslow Dr., Education Commissioner
Melvin M. Belli, 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Landmarks Preservation Board
Steven J. Doi, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
C. Mackey E. Salazar, 183 San Benito Way, City Planning Commissioner
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli St., Retired
John T. Fang, 170 Gelert Dr., Publisher, State Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Anna Kyle Pausewang, 30 Cunningham Pl., Legal Assistant
Tony Kiley, 473-11th Ave., Vice President, District One Political Action
Kevin G. Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Property Consultant
John S. Tang, M.D., 2184 Funston Ave., Physician
Timothy A. Tosta, 870 Ashbury St., Attorney
Jung Roy Gee, 665 Pine St., Investor, Education Researcher
William Bernstein, 1000 Franklin St., Attorney
Robert P. Varni, 10 Miller Pl., Charterman-Police Data Systems
Frank S. Yee, 358 Los Palmos Dr., Real Estate Finance; Teacher
Rev. Charles A. Mclhenny, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
William Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney at Law
F. Theodore Kitt, 2801 Broadway, Lawyer
Robin Tom, 28 Annapolis Ter., V.P.-Branch Manager, S & L
Velma Petersilie, 665 Pine St., Teacher
Ed Pond, 16-38th Ave., Insurance broker/Accountant
S.M. Saroyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Business Enterprises/Lawyer
Frank N. Alioto, 2898 Vallejo St., Restaurant Owner
W.F. O'Keefe, Jr., 444 Coretta Ave., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Assn.

EUGENE S. HOPP, M.D.
My address is 601 Van Ness Avenue, Opera Plaza
My occupation is Physician
My qualifications for office are: For the past thirteen years I have served on the Board of Education as an independent voice committed to the goal of educating all our children to their fullest potential. The current stress on teaching the basics must continue, combined with offerings of high technology and vocational courses designed to prepare our diverse student population for a changing future. I stand for an integrated educational program and welcome parents and the public to assist me in this challenge.

Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Eugene S. Hopp are:
Molly M. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Telecommunications Executive
Dianne Feinstein, 3020 Lyon St., Mayor
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Attorney
Bill Maher, 69 Ellis St., Supervisor
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Agrapino R. Cebatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodiona M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, Vice President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr, 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Police Commissioner
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Castitas Ave., Police Commissioner
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Commissioner, Community College
Julie Tang, 768-18th Ave., Board Member S F Community College
John F. Crowley, 87 Los Palmos Dr., Labor Official
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venas St., Public Accountant
Amos J. Castro, 1401 California St., Physician
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Civil Rights Administrator
Harry Polland, 637 Powell St., Economist
Saul Mades, 75 Country Club Dr., Retired, School Admin.
Jo Birnbaum, 1750 Taylor St., Housewife
Anita H. Sanchez, 44 Restani Way, Social Worker
Chadwick C. Ertola, 660 Greenwich St., Attonrey
Naomi Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Businesswoman
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
Rae G. Richardson, 1714 Fillmore St., Assoc. Professor
Max L. Christensen, 2 Heather Ave., Clergyman
Leo J. Murphy, Sr., 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Lane E. De Lara, 2 Lenox Way, Educational Consultant
Gregory C. Lintner, 2660 Webster St., Realtor

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

TERRY HUGUNIN
My address is 1824 Noriega Street
My occupation is Consultant
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: Those of us who were teenagers during President Kennedy’s Appolo Space Program thought there was nothing we and our nation might not accomplish: “We’re going to the moon in ten years!” Thanks to outfits like the National Education Association, the science oriented New Frontiers of the 60’s have given way to the “other-directedness” of the Aquarian Age. Their goal: form a society of androgynous pacifists—study their literature. Mine is to restore the problem-solving orientation appropriate to Judeo-Christian culture. Help me mobilize our schools to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative and overcome the nuclear war threat.

Terry Hugunin

The sponsors for Terry Hugunin are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altmirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortliff Operator
Michael Frijio, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elinor Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kiber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kiber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 750 Sweeney St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Leczano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lida G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayan, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staininec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

JAMES LEGARE
My address is 254 Oak Street
My occupation is Motor Truck Operator
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I am committed to installing a sound educational program in our schools as the basis for getting our country and economy moving again—in the American tradition. We need to develop young minds through a program of classical education and to protect them by wiping out drugs in the schools and in the nation.

I propose to reform the school system along these lines:
1) Classical geometry and physics, as typified by Plato, Archimedes, Cusa Kepler, and Leibiniz
2) Classical poetry, music, and drama, exemplified by Homer, Aeschylus, Dante, Shakespeare, Schiller, Bach, and Beethoven

James Legare

The sponsors for James Legare are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortliff Operator
Michael Frijio, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elinor Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kiber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
Micaela M. Leczano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lida G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayan, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staininec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
Nicholas E. Vallejo, 875 Cayuga Ave., Electrician
John Vozitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

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

JO ANNE MILLER

My address is 1920 Quint Street
My occupation is Parent and Teacher

My qualifications for office are: I am the mother of two children in San Francisco Public Schools. I believe in the Public School System, and have a personal interest in its quality and effectiveness. I am a teacher of the blind. I am President of the Glen Park School Site Advisory Committee, and hold other elected civic offices.

The lack of parent representation on the School Board has contributed to a lack of parent and citizen involvement, a lack of long-term planning and vision in school administration, and a failure to commit the School District to a plan and goal of excellence for all children.

JoAnne Miller

The sponsors for JoAnne Miller are:

Julie C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Angel D. Contreras, 1461 Alabama St., Administrator of Headstart
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Dening St., President, San Francisco NOW
Linda Fries, 830-35th Ave., Community Organizer
Bob Geary, 2578 Great Highway, San Francisco Police Officer
Louise Harvey, 673 Fulton St., Educational Consultant
Marilee Hearn, 3010 Turk Blvd., Teacher
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Ron Huberman, 51 Walter St., District Attorney Investigator
Darol Inouye, 251 Gates St., Attorney
Cleve Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Assistant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir., ILWU
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Jean E. Kortum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Member of Board of Supervisors
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Business Executive
Hugh B. Miller, 355 Roosevelt Way, Attorney
John L. Molinar, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
James E. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Tax Cab Owner
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingersen Ave., Executive Director, CAHEED, Inc.
Jerry Ringerman, 485 Crestmont Dr., Executive Director, San Francisco Jewish Community Center
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., President, AAFUM

BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones Street
My occupation is Transportation Analyst

My qualifications for office are: I believe I have provided outstanding leadership during my eight years on the San Francisco Board of Education. This is evidenced by the fact that test scores have improved and new programs have attracted students back from private schools.

As an active parent, I know San Francisco's schools first-hand. I have worked conscientiously for our children's future. I have the vision and I have gained the practical skills necessary to continue building our school district into one of the best large urban districts in the nation.

Benjamin Tom

The sponsors for Ben Tom are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Supervisor, San Francisco
John L. Molinar, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commission
William K. Coble, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director, CYO
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Ben L. Hon, 1 Villa Ter., Banker, Executive
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker, Community College Board Member
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director, Pre-Trial Diversion Project
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor, City and County
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Supervisor
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Myra G. Kropf, 1940-12th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Board Member School Administrator
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Business Representative
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Richard D. Hensley, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman, 16th District

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Candidates for College Board

ERNEST "CHUCK" AYALA

My address is 4402-20th Street
My occupation is Youth Director, CYO-Urban Development Division

My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan, South of Market neighborhood. Attended public and parochial schools, including City and Lone Mountain Colleges. My involvement in community development and public service is with youth in Education, Employment and Delinquency Prevention, in addition to developing and administering Senior Citizens and Veterans Programs. Business management background in labor, insurance and real estate provides me with a balanced approach to fiscal and administrative objectives of the Community College District. My continued goal for the Community College District is to retain its open door policy and remain responsive to the educational and vocational needs of the people.

Ernest Chuck Ayala

The sponsors for Ernest "Chuck" Ayala are:
Reginald Y. Alexander, 182 Middlefield Dr., Vice Chancellor, Certificated
Bernice E. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Homemaker
Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College District
Robert E. Burton, 8 Scout Blvd., Member, S.F. Community College Board
Vincent J. Callan, 4038 19th St., Retired
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
Tina Burgess Con, 59 Chabot St., House Wife
Marjorie M Colvin, 1835 Franklin St. #1403, Housewife
Peter J. Fatouh, 30 Grand View Ave., Businessman
William L. Fazio, 110 Inverness Dr, Asst District Attorney
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripleys St., Management Consultant
Al Graf, 859 Bryant St., Businessman
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Marcel Kapulica, 2470 22nd Ave., Dental Laboratory-Owner
Louis E. Lagger, 4001 21st St., District Manager, Packing Co.
Dorothy J. Lubetich, 15 Florentine St., Retired
Ernestine A. McInerney, 444 20th St., School Clerk/Housewife
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., 1789 Eucalyptus St., State Assemblyman Retired
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., President, S.F. Community College Board
Susan Ann Roualde, 340-A Taraval St., Florist
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 453 Bartlett St., President, S.F. Police Commission
Bob (Robert) Schmidt, 4081 21st St., Librarian
Thomatia N. Scott, 1912-1/2 Broderick St., Youth Program Coordinator
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba St., Educator/Police Commissioner
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave. U.C. Regent
Bernard J. Ward, 3300 Kirkham St., Atty at law
Bill Zorzakis, 545 Castro St., Shoe Repairer

AMOS CLEOPHILUS BROWN

My address is 111 Lunado Way
My occupation is Clergyman
My age is 43

My qualifications for office are: I hold the B.A., M.Div. and D.D. degrees. 16 years of public service on boards of education throughout the U.S. more than qualifies me for the position.

My services on the Board of Governors since 1982 reflect that I am competent and able to work with a team of governors to ensure the delivery of a quality education system for all persons in our community who desire training for marketable skills. Community College also must serve the needs of those who for various reasons have not had the opportunity of going to other institutions of higher learning for training.

Amos C. Brown

The sponsors for Amos C. Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Member, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Scout Blvd., Member, Community College Board
Priscilla A. Dennard, 210 Broad St., Secretary
James Gordon Emerson, Jr., 175 Beaumont St., Clergyman
Mayor Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Zelma R. Harrison, 1957 Hayes St., Bookkeeper
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Grindavel A. Jackson, 257 Kensington Way, Retired
Clifton R. Jeffers, 1883 14th Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor
John L. Molinaro, 30 16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Lauraret Newkirk, 354 Brussels St., System Support Librarian
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Naomi Shines, 756 Page St., Fiscal Clerk
Rabbi Malcolm M. Saper, 1095 Clement St., Rabbi
Julie Tang, 780 18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillritas St., Minister
Hannibal A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergyman
Tomothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, President, College Board
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Candidates for College Board

PATRICK C. FITZGERALD

My address is 128 Detroit Street
My occupation is San Francisco County Central Committee, 16th Assembly District.
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: Am married, father of three children and a homeowner
• Graduated: St. Ignatius College Prep. and City College of San Francisco
• Elected San Francisco County Central Committee (since 1970)
• California State Central Committee (since 1978)
• Attended San Francisco 1984 National Presidential Convention for Mondale-Ferraro
• Served on San Francisco City Government CATV Task Force Educational Access Committee
• Instrumental in adoption of San Francisco City College Labor Studies Program
• Great Nephew of former San Francisco County Supervisor Tom O’Dowd
• Past Secretary San Francisco County Central Committee
• Strong opponent 1983 Feinstein Recall
• Successfully fought peripheral canal
• Support Propositions: 33 (disabled homeowners) and 40 (political campaign reform).

Patrick C. Fitzgerald

The sponsors for Patrick C. Fitzgerald are:
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney
Lee S. Dolton, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official
John J. Moynan, 2985-24th Ave., Labor Leader
Terence Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Marion L. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Social Worker
Patricia K. Moores, 1762-17th Ave., Tax Consultant/Bookkeeper
Josephine Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Central Committee Candidate

Committee woman
Clara Stein, 2330 Sloat Blvd., Cashier
Brian J. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Real Estate Broker
Sue T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., State Central Committee Woman
Mildred K. Bird, 1762-17th Ave., Retired
Mary Ann Cowen, 134 Detroit St., Secretary
Charles T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Retired
Emily H. Shimmon, 19 Middlefield St., Housewife
Thomas P. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Displayman
Esther F. Zott, 75 Middlefield St., Retired
Peter B. Paragas, 1923 San Jose Ave., Engineering Graduate
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Adriano Bigiotti, 131 Detroit St., Retired
A. Lee Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, City College Graduate
Kenneth J. Lukas, 215 Detroit St., Carpenter
Lloyd A. Quinn, 96 Staples St., Retired
Louise E. Quinn, 96 Staples St., Retired
William T. Bray, 207 San Juan Ave., Gateman
Mary B. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Homemaker
Lisa L. Kobucar, 135 San Felipe Way, County Central Committee Woman
Suzzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
Jim Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Arlo H. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney

DEAN GOODMAN

My address is 825 Geary Street #703
My occupation is Retired Teacher/Actor
My age is 64
My qualifications for office are: Thirty years of teaching, an educator's concern for quality instruction, and a citizen's awareness of the need for budget control. As the first fulltime president of the Community College Federation of Teachers, Local 2121 and as a former staff member of the District I know well the policies and procedures which form the structure of the Community College and the College Centers.

If elected, I will insist on fair hiring practices, and as a member of that most diverse of all groups, our Senior Citizens, I will support college services for all adults regardless of individual differences.

Dean Goodman

The sponsors for Dean Goodman are:
Priscilla Alden, 1677 Bush St., #3, Actress
Ugo Baldassari, 988 Dolores St., Theatre Director
James E. Ballard, 2 Arbor St., Teacher
Sheldon I Balman, 5 Perigo Ter., Attorney
Laurent R. Broussal, 855 Quintara St., Administrator, College College
Kimo Cochran, 1330 Bush St., Bar Owner
Donald G. Climent, 117 Ord St., Refugee Resettlement Counselor
Lauri Fried-Lee, 435 19th Ave., Community College Instructor
William Gundel, 3415 Franklin St., Credit Adjuster
Frances T. Hughes, 2649 Polk St., Legal Secretary
Donna Ilyin, 76 6th Ave., Counselor
Lynda Bergren Kalb, 24 Magnolia St., Singer/Actress
Michael J. Mandle, 12 Marne St., Attorney
Donald J. Miller, 26 Leo St., Furniture Manufacturer
Jay Moran, 1667 Page St., Business Representative
Allen Nomura, 177 Bocana St., Theatrical Photographer
Judy Winn-Bell Olsen, 1253 29th Ave., Teacher/Author/Editor
Roger E. W-B Olsen, 1253 29th Ave., Publisher
Frank Reilly, 3415 Divisadero St., Advertising/Actor
James J. Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Rev. James E. Sandmeier, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
Eve Stoddard, 180 Diamond St., Probate Administration
Daniel A. Sullivan, 1590 Sacramento St., Attorney
Doug Trantham, 701 Taylor St., Pianist
Sigrid Wunschmidt, 1142 DeHaro St., Actress
Samuel L. Zanze, 2581 25th Ave., Businessman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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Candidates for College Board

ANDRE F. PEHARGOU
My address is 3840 Fulton Street
My occupation is Civil Servant
My qualifications for office are: I have been a resident of San Francisco for 34 years. I am a graduate of California State University San Francisco; San Francisco City College, and Lowell High School.

Most taxpayers are not benefiting from the Community College System due to lack of information and lack of convenient locations.

As a Board member, I will advocate a strong academic curriculum; more neighborhood locations to facilitate senior citizens and working taxpayers; better utilization of present facilities, and a decrease in tuition fees for City residents.

If you want expanded services to help benefit you, give me your support on election day.

Andre F. Pehargou

The sponsors for Andre F. Pehargou are:
William Angelopoulos, 59 Prague St., Employed
Renee Boulay, 603 Arguello Blvd., Retired
Josephine Bucchiotti, 355 25th Ave., Retired
Andre Carrey, 187 2nd Ave., Retired
James Edward Coleman, 620 Banks St., Supervisor
Alice Crowe, 1827 Balboa St., Part Time Office Worker
Robert S. Flahavan, 151 Buchanan St., Operations Officer, S. F. Airport
Emma Garriques, 2702 Anza St., Retired
Diana Hautman, 361 25th Ave., Teacher
Rose Hautman, 720 La Playa St., #907, Retired
Paulette Henderson, 798 Naples St., Retired
Paul Keplinger, 3832 Fulton St., Concierge
Anna Konor, 3315 Irving St., Retired
James Courtney Kovach, 1282 43rd Ave., Lithographer
Eva Lim, 3832 Fulton St., Asst. Paymistress
D. Martin, 87 Seward St., Supervisor

JULIE TANG
My address is 788-18th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor’s degree in Psychology from the University of San Francisco; Master’s in Education from Stanford University; Juris Doctorate from Hastings College of Law; a wife, mother, former teacher and counselor; and presently, Assistant District Attorney in San Francisco.

I have served diligently, always conscious of my responsibility to all the communities of San Francisco who gave me the highest number of votes four years ago. I strive to ensure that the Community College will continue providing quality education to all students, even during financial crises, without sacrificing student or faculty needs. As the only woman board member, I actively support women’s issues.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
Sala Burton, 8 Sloot Blvd., Congresswoman
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal
Arton Agnos, 679 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry L. Britt, 783-A Guerrero St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member Board of Supervisors
Yori Wada, 564-4th Ave., Univ of Calif Regent
John L. Molinari, 30-10th Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Commissioner, Board of Education/School Administrator
Arlo E. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Constance O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant SF Sheriff’s Dept.
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloot Blvd., Member SF Community College Board
Madeleine H. Russell, 3778 Washington St., Investments
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shafter St., Planning Commissioner
Agrapino R. Cerbo, 471 Holtman Ave., Electrical Engineer
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Anne Bellale Dauke, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Director
Louse H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member SF Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Community Activist
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Incumbent SF Supervisor
Bette W. Landis, 44 Entraula Ct., Volunteer
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney’s Investigator
Jeffrey K. Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 910 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Educator

My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

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

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

Moy Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy Velasquez are:
Lilian Aldea, 231 Granada Ave., Teacher
Concepcion G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Teacher
Melandro Busto, 49 Capp St., Student
Victoriano G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Mechanic
Stasia Cagara, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Sales
Rosita I. Castaneda, 18 Guy Pl., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion P. Cepedes, 951 Prague St., Teacher
Cheryl R. Conrad, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student
Theresa N. Fabro, 4186 Mission St., School Lunchroom Manager
Kathleen A. Guerra, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Technician
Odellia Jones, 1775 Newcomb Ave., Housekeeper
Felisa P. Misenas, 266 Brighton Ave., School Lunch Helper
Basil C. Nickerson, 356-6th St., Self Employed
Willie B. Nicholas, 1231-5th Ave., Custodian
Jack Lee Ponewash, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Production Manager
Margaret M. Powers, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Customer Service
Clarice D. Robinson, 2445 Harrison St., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion A. Ramos, 2700 Folsom St., Room Cleaner
Murdie Washington, 195 Highland St., Monitor
David A. Woodard, 397 Green St., Chef

DR. TIM WOLFRED

My address is 91 Sanchez Street
My occupation is incumbent, President, San Francisco Community College Board

My qualifications for office are: As an incumbent, I am proud of a College Board that, with less dollars than it had four years ago, has kept all programs operating and has expanded services to San Franciscans most dependent on a healthy community college system for access to job skills training and a basic college education. Neighborhood college centers have moved into larger, renovated facilities. Vocational offerings in fields like computer technologies, nursing, and auto mechanics have been updated. Classes in language skills have been strengthened in immigrant communities. We are a Board dedicated to quality education open to all San Franciscans.

Dr. Tim Wolfred

The sponsors for Dr. Tim Wolfred are:
Sall Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
Willie Brown, 1200 Gough St., Assembly Member
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembly Member
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff, City and County of San Francisco
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Burt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Alan Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Member, Community College Board
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Sodonia Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., School Board Member
Libby Deneheim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member
Argirio R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., School Board Member
Carliota T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Harold Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hill重要内容, Pastor, Glide Church
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher
Sandy Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Thomas Peretti, 3757-16th St., Banker
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Official
Carole Migden, 563-28th St., Executive Director, Operation Concern

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Port Revenue Bonds

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

YES 253
NO 254

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Port Commission operates the Port of San Francisco. When funds are needed for Port construction or improvements, the Commission may issue revenue bonds to raise funds. A majority of the voters must approve these bonds before they can be issued. The revenue bonds are then paid from Port revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance several improvements of Port property. These improvements include modernizing container handling facilities, upgrading various piers, constructing a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf, and renovating certain other Port structures and property. The bonds would then be paid off from Port revenues.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance improvements of Port property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Port Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

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

- Bond redemption: $42,500,000
- Bond interest: 81,761,400
- Total debt service requirement: 124,261,400

"Based on a three year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning four years after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $4,462,000 to a maximum of $5,760,000 annually for twenty-seven years.

"In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Port revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Port sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Port. Analysis of projected resources available to the Port indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On July 30 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on a motion placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 51.
Port Revenue Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The revitalization of the Port of San Francisco will bring new jobs and new tax revenue to the City. A healthy port, with increased ship traffic, will bring millions each year to the San Francisco economy.

By delaying modernizations in the past, the Port of San Francisco lost the bulk of its maritime business to other Bay Area and West Coast cities. The same mistakes must not be made twice. We must allow the Port to use revenues to finance continued improvements.

Proposition A does not authorize any new taxes. Proposition A simply authorizes the Port to use revenues to finance improvements and expansion.

Proposition A will allow for the modernization of existing container cargo terminals on the southern waterfront. These improved facilities will retain current business and will bring new lines to San Francisco. The return of the shipping business will bring back long lost blue collar jobs to the waterfront as well as white collar jobs.

In addition, Proposition A will provide for expansion of the passenger facility, a new breakwater to protect the commercial fishing fleet, and improved rail access to the port. In all, Proposition A will upgrade and modernize San Francisco Port facilities so as to make them competitive with other ports across the Bay and throughout the West Coast.

The complete modernization effort will be done at no cost to the taxpayers. Instead, the Port of San Francisco's income will be used to finance long-term revenue bonds.

The people of San Francisco deserve a first-rate port. We urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote YES on Proposition A.

As Mayor, I have worked hard to restore our port to its historic pre-eminence as a major gateway to the Far East.

Once again, major shipping lines are docking in San Francisco. Just recently, two of the largest container vessel operators, China Ocean Shipping Corporation and Columbus Lines, signed agreements to use this port.

Not only modern cargo carriers, but passenger liners as well are being drawn to San Francisco in a remarkable renascence of maritime commerce.

But if there is to be a lasting renewal of our waterfront, the port must be competitive with other port cities anxiously contending for the burgeoning Pacific trade. The port, if it is to prosper, must modernize and enlarge its basic maritime facilities.

That's the purpose of Proposition A.

Proposition A will make the Port of San Francisco truly and vigorously competitive. And it will not cost the taxpayers a penny.

Proposition A will authorize $42.5 million in revenue bonds for vital waterfront projects, including the conversion of Pier 80 into a modern, state-of-the-art container facility and the enlargement and modernization of cargo operations at Piers 94 and 96.

Additionally, Proposition A will provide funds for repairing the now deteriorating Jefferson Street Seawall and will match Federal dollars for construction of a much-needed breakwater to protect the City's fishing fleet at Fisherman's Wharf.

Proposition A also will finance expansion of the passenger terminal at Pier 35.

Proposition A is a prudent investment in the City's future. And these bonds are payable only from port revenues—your taxes will not be increased.

More ships, with more cargo and more passengers, mean more jobs and greater economic vitality for our city.

Proposition A will make our port, once again, a strong and lasting competitor for the commerce of the Pacific Basin. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco needs a good, working port. Vote yes on Proposition A and help bring it about.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Citizens of San Francisco are worried about the deterioration of the port. Most of us can remember when the port was a thriving, bustling commercial enterprise, and the docks were maintained, clean, efficient, and busy.

But, the port has not adapted to container cargo and may be losing the few shipping lines that it now serves.

We must restructure the docks for active container shipping, and bring in railway lines to service the docks.

We have one of the few deep water ports in America, an essential for modern shipping. LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT BEING ONE OF THE BEST PORTS IN THE WEST AGAIN!

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Wendy Nelder
President of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will permit the Port of San Francisco to issue bonds to finance needed construction and improvements. This would give the Port the same financing ability the Airport now has.

Through the issuance of revenue bonds, the Port would be able to undertake necessary improvements AT NO COST TO TAXPAYERS.

San Francisco deserves a modern, thriving port. Proposition A will help us build modern terminals, a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf which will help keep commercial fishermen in San Francisco, repair the seawall at Jefferson Street and expand our Passenger Terminal to handle increased cruise business that brings millions of dollars into our local economy.

Proposition A will give the Port of San Francisco the ability to make these kinds of improvements. Please join me in voting YES.

Sala Burton,
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A offers San Franciscans the opportunity to direct the future of the Port of San Francisco.

This measure will provide our Port with the key to the future.

We must keep pace with new developments, increase cargo and create new jobs. For every fifty new containers we move, 1.67 new jobs will be created.

This measure also includes funding for construction of the Fisherman's Wharf Breakwater, which is critically needed and long overdue.

Take part in the future of our Port. Join with me in voting YES on Proposition A.

Milton Marks,
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a waterfront city. We have a superb natural harbor, which is also one of the few really deep water harbors—vital for modern deep water cargo ships.

We have used our badly deteriorating and long unimproved pier facilities to their maximum efficiency. But . . . times are changing. We must move NOW to keep pace with new developments, or risk enormous losses in cargo shipping, commercial fishing, and tourist trade.

It is ESSENTIAL that we adapt to container cargo that can be moved by train, truck, and ship.

Research has been done on what could give us the greatest increase in efficiency and profits for the very least amount of money. And the answer is: modernizing the South Terminal for adaptation to container cargo; providing rail access to the docks; protecting the commercial fishing fleet with a breakwater; and expanding passenger-handling facilities for cruise passenger tourists.

Prop A will provide these improvements RIGHT NOW. And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION
Arthur H. Coleman, President
James Rudden, Vice President
Gordon Lau, Member
Anne Halsted, Member
James Herman, Member

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

Fisherman's Wharf is a valued segment of the community and needs your help to ensure its economic well-being.

A YES vote on Proposition A will provide the needed financing to build the long awaited breakwater to ensure the safety of our commercial fishing fleet, create new berths and new jobs.

A YES vote on Proposition A will repair the Jefferson Street Seawall before it becomes a dangerous hazard to our visitors and to our community.

A YES vote will insure the economic vitality of Fisherman's Wharf as well as the entire San Francisco Waterfront.

Join with us and vote YES.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Louis Ferrari, President
Crab Boat Owner's Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The opportunity is NOW!
Our Northern Waterfront is alive with activity—increase in passenger ships, thriving commercial developments.
Let us fuse that energy into our Southern Waterfront and take advantage of our natural deep water. That means newer, deeper draft merchant ships, increased cargoes and new jobs.
Missed opportunities cannot be recaptured. So act now! Don't let this opportunity get away.
Vote YES on Proposition A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our waterfront is an outstandingly beautiful and profitable aspect of San Francisco. The port has been badly neglected, however. We need to VOTE YES ON PROP A to improve and rebuild cargo and passenger facilities.
PROP A will guarantee increased maritime activities, new jobs, the revival of our fishing industry, and the safety of shoreline areas.
And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!
For our neighborhood, and for our City, VOTE YES ON PROP A!

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors

Phyllis Kern
Golden Gate Democratic Club* Open Space Committee*
Jim Wachob
District 8 Democratic Club*
Kevin Malone
District 8 Democratic Club*
Bette Landis
Democratic Women's Forum*
Rebecca Evans
Sierra Club*
Beverly Karnatz
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown*

*for identification purposes only

Richard Livingston
Adria Garabedian
Andrea Jepson
Madrid Hamilton
Dr. Tim Wolfd
Wallinda McCrea
Douglas Engmann
Dale Carlson
Stafford Buckley
Dick Pabich
Ron Huberman

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

San Francisco has always been a great port city. And the San Francisco Port has always been a leading employer of minorities.

But the Port has sadly deteriorated. It has not kept up with modernizations and improvements. And what is even worse, it has not kept up with the competition. The Port MUST adapt to container cargo, and put in railway access to the docks. With your vote YES ON A, we can take advantage of our deep water harbor, attract more shipping trade, increase cargoes, and produce many more jobs.

And... AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!
VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Naomi Gray
Doris Thomas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our Port now needs $42 million to develop San Francisco's maritime facilities to compete with ports such as Oakland, Seattle and San Diego.

These improved facilities are vital to San Francisco's competition for jobs and trade for the Pacific. Currently all major west coast ports are building to meet the growing needs of America's Pacific Trade. These ports have each spent an average of $57 million on recent container cargo expansion while San Francisco has spent nothing.

San Francisco must have at least comparable facilities in order to compete in this market. If the port is not developed for container cargo, San Francisco can forget about being a major port on the west coast as well as lose the jobs and revenue that a modern port could produce.

The Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that you vote to bring San Francisco the jobs and business that will be created by these revenue bonds. The bonds will be paid off from Port revenue and there is no taxpayer risk.

If you want to see the Port continue to grow and prosper vote yes on Proposition A.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reconstruct municipal harbor facilities!!!:

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

Juanita G. Raven
Democratic County Committeeman
Bob Geary
Democratic County Committeeman
Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Martin Eng

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

When something is railroaded through City Hall on a "fast track", it is always difficult not to join the stampede. This, however, is a bond issue in an amount larger than necessary to perform the actual work contemplated; not backed by written leases; and not backed even by "letter agreements" with corporations which supposedly will use Piers 80, 94 and 96 if improvements are made. This bond issue was rushed through the Board of Supervisors. Transmitted to the Board on July 24th, a scant six days later (on July 30th) and without a specific noticed public hearing, the Board voted 7-1 to place it on the ballot. I dissented because more time was needed for a proper analysis and public input.

Presently, the Port has a debt service requirement of approximately $104,000,000.00. This proposed revenue bond issue would increase the debt service requirement to $228,261,400.00; a staggering rise. The $42,500,000.00 bond issue would produce but $40,202,000.00 in net proceeds. The Port has a surplus of about $19,000,000.00, of which approximately $15,000,000.00 is available for capital projects. The Controller says $49,254,660.00, would thus be available for capital projects costing $41,610,000.00.

The Port is borrowing $7,644,660.00 more than is needed for these seven capital projects. Why? The Port admits it has no long-term written commitments for Piers 80, 94 and 96 which account for $37,570,000.00 of the total bond issue. How can we be assured that the bondholders will be repaid by revenues from those piers if there are no long-term commitments?

Moreover, the Port hasn't even secured written "letter agreements" from corporations to assure that if those improvements are made, they will sign long-term commitments. Ironically, but $4,000,000.00 of the bond issue would be spent on needed improvements for Fisherman's Wharf tenants, who generate almost 50% of net Port income, money which would be used to repay the money borrowed for Piers 80, 94 and 96. It's like the tail wagging the dog.

Selling bonds is nothing more than borrowing money. Why borrow more money than you have to, and why borrow money for projects which don't have long-term tenants? Be assured that even if this passes, I intend to persist in making Port officials answer those very questions.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

MOTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION A

MOTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A MEASURE AUTHORIZING THE PORT COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS TO FINANCE THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION OF CERTAIN PORT FACILITIES TO BE LOCATED AT THE PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby orders submitted to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 6, 1984 a measure authorizing the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to issue revenue bonds, all as set forth in the following measure, to wit:

Shall the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $42,500,000 the proceeds of which will be used to modernize container handling facilities and to upgrade various other maritime-oriented facilities at the Port of San Francisco's piers 35, 80, 94 and 96 and at the Jefferson Street seawall, to construct a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf, to construct an intermodal container transfer facility, to install a backflow prevention system at various locations, to replace various transformers and capacitors throughout the port, and to acquire, construct or renovate certain works, property or structures necessary or convenient for the operation of, and at, the Port of San Francisco, which facilities are operated by the Port Commission?

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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USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Water Revenue Bonds

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

YES 256

NO 257

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission operates the San Francisco Water Department. When the Commission needs funds to acquire, improve or develop Water Department facilities, it may issue revenue bonds to raise the funds. Before the Commission can issue revenue bonds, a majority of the voters must approve. The revenue bonds are then paid from Water Department revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds. Funds from the sale of the bonds would be used to acquire, improve or develop facilities necessary for the operation of the Water Department, including filtration plants and reservoirs. The bonds would be paid off from the revenues of the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance Water Department improvements.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Public Utilities Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

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

- Bond redemption $104,000,000
- Bond interest 169,260,000
- Total debt service requirement $273,260,000

"Based on a five year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning one year after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $3,467,000 to a maximum of $14,022,000 annually for thirty-one years.

"In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Water Department revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Water Department sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Water Department. Analysis of projected resources available to the Water Department indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on a resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The money from these bonds will be used to assure that drinking water we take from our Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs on the Peninsula is pure and meets all health standards. The bonds will be repaid from revenues of our Water Department. Not a penny will be charged on the property tax rolls or to the general taxpayers.

We have two huge lakes along side I-280 on the Peninsula, the Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs. About 15% of our drinking water in normal times comes from these lakes and others in Alameda County. For decades we used this water without filtration. Now, however, health officials tell us that all of the water from our Peninsula lakes must be filtered before it can be used. We now have a very limited filtering capacity which means that if, for any reason, our water supply from the Sierras were interrupted or reduced and we would need more local water, we would be unable to make full use of Crystal Springs water. There now is no filter plant at Crystal Springs. Whatever water we use from there must be pumped up to a small filtration plant at San Andreas before it can enter the system. This very severely limits the amount of drinking water we can draw from our nearest supply, and it is expensive. Passage of Proposition B would change all that.

By voting YES on B, you will provide for water system improvements including a new filtration plant right at Crystal Springs, for the expansion of the small plant at San Andreas, and for a necessary storage reservoir.

Your YES on B vote is an investment in the quality of our drinking water—an assurance that water from our nearest supply will be available to us pure, meeting all health requirements, when we need it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Generations ago, San Franciscans had the foresight to build one of the most magnificent water systems in the world—Hetch Hetchy, which brings water to San Francisco from the High Sierras.

Now, we must modernize the system to keep pace with higher standards of water quality.

Proposition B will authorize the San Francisco Water Department to issue $104 million in revenue bonds.

The money will be used to improve the system by expanding existing plants and by building additional filtration, treatment and holding facilities on Water Department properties on the Peninsula.

These facilities will provide safe drinking water for future generations of San Franciscans. Presently, if any of the existing facilities suffered a breakdown, the City could be forced to rely upon unfiltered water from Crystal Springs. The State Department of Public Health has directed the Water Department to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Our water is safe. It meets all state and Federal quality standards, and we want to keep it that way. Proposition B will assure low turbidity (silt content), reduce asbestos content, and prevent the spread of giardia lamblia, a virus not now found in our water system, but which could be brought in as watersheds areas become more populated.

Proposition B, which will not have any effect on our tax structure, is a prudent investment, protecting our drinking water into the future. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote yes on Proposition B and help guarantee us pure, plentiful water.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION C

Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

YES 259

NO 260

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Department of Public Health operates the county hospitals, such as San Francisco General and Laguna Honda, and all other county public health services. The Department is run by a Public Health Director, who is appointed by the City's Chief Administrative Officer and who is responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would create a Health Commission, and place the Department of Public Health under the control of the Commission. The Commission would have seven members, appointed by the Mayor; no more than three members would be doctors, nurses, hospital administrators or other health care professionals. The Commission would appoint a Public Health Director, responsible to the Commission, to administer the Department. The Public Health Director could appoint and remove deputies to help administer the Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of a Health Commission appointed by the Mayor, and to be run by a Public Health Director, appointed by the Health Commission.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of the Chief Administrative Officer and to be run by a Public Health Director appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs of the Health Department, by approximately $8,400 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 32.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Public Health Department has a budget of over $270 million and a staff of 5000, making it the largest agency in City government. Its responsibilities are many and far-reaching: San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital; emergency medical services; mental health services; sanitation; public health education; district health centers; inspection of public and private facilities. The list is long and growing.

In recent years, the list of problems facing departmental administrators has, unfortunately, also grown. Emergency Aid stations were closed. Ambulance service was drastically altered. Proposals to reorganize community mental health services were promoted and rejected, causing confusion for all. The AIDS crisis. The investigations at San Francisco General Hospital. And on and on.

Too often, these decisions and these issues were considered in a vacuum, without public input, without public debate, and without public scrutiny.

Why? In order to protect the Department of Public Health from the graft and corruption that plagued our City at the turn of the century, the Charter placed the department under the Chief Administrative Officer's auspices rather than a commission. Fifty years later, the department has outgrown this cumbersome arrangement. It is time to bring the administration of this important agency into the 20th Century, mirroring the management of other City departments.

Proposition C will establish a seven-member Health Commission, appointed by the Mayor, to set policy and supervise the Public Health Department. The commission will include both providers and consumers of health services. It will bring the Department more directly under the Mayor's control, allowing for more timely responses to issues and problems. Most importantly, it will ensure that the department is publicly accountable for its actions.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Public health policy has changed and the governance of our public health department must change too.

In the past few years the state and federal governments have shifted more and more of the responsibility for public health management to local governments.

Recent experience shows that our health department is not presently equipped to manage public health programs in the most effective manner.

Proposition C will streamline management—cutting two levels of bureaucracy while opening up our public health policy to the public itself.

I urge a "yes" vote on Proposition C.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Since 1971, the Department of Public Health has been plagued with problems and crises at its hospitals, clinics and emergency aid stations. Most recently, we again faced the threat of San Francisco General losing its accreditation. These many incidents are deeply disturbing, raising troubling questions in the public mind: Why do these problems persist? Why can't something be done about them once and for all?

In 1979, the national organization that accredits all hospitals reported that San Francisco General's "major problems ... are related to the lack of an effective governing body free from the political decision-making process which results in delayed activity, inadequate funding, etc." Last January, the State auditors also cited the absence of "a governing body legally responsible for hospital governance" as a cause for "ineffective management."

No other hospital in California operates without a board of directors. Only one other department in San Francisco (Public Works) operates without a commission. Instead, San Francisco General and the Health Department are run by a bureaucracy, insulated from public accountability.

Proposition C establishes a commission for the Health Department, one that will hold public hearing, make public decisions, and be publicly accountable. Vote YES.

Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Doris Ward

(Continued)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

San Francisco’s population is aging. In a few short years, a greater percentage of our citizens will be seniors—most living independently on fixed incomes, many frail and over 75—than those of other California cities. They will need nutritional information, home health care, and a broad range of coordinated social services.

The Department of Health, San Francisco General, Laguna Honda, the District Health Centers—these are critical providers of senior services. And as more and more state and federal programs are shifted to local agencies, the Department’s role and responsibilities will dramatically increase.

How will the Department respond to this increased responsibility? How can we ensure that it will develop policies and programs that meet seniors’ needs? And how can we be sure that these programs operate efficiently and effectively?

Proposition C is a big step in the right direction. VOTE YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is important for women.

Women provide the majority of services offered by the Health Department. Indeed public health is traditionally the domain of women and nurses. And while the many crises at General are too often blamed on nursing care, nurses virtually have no role in planning or organizing service delivery.

Women are also the major consumers of the Depart-
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The policies governing San Francisco General affect every consumer and provider of health services in the City, yet there is little accountability to San Francisco taxpayers. No private hospital with General's size and influence operates without a board of trustees or directors. Indeed, no private organization of any kind with a $270 million annual budget—business, corporation, non-profit foundation, whatever—operates without a governing board. Why does General?

As General bounces from one crisis to the next, with state and federal agencies threatening increasingly drastic actions, the weakness of the current management structure becomes clear to all. The Hospital and the Health Department need a commission, where public hearings can surface problems and issues in a timely fashion; where policies can be developed with the cooperation of private providers and consumers. The Health Commission will not be a watchdog meddling in day-to-day affairs, but an advocate for General, one providing continuity, stability and a rational decision-making process with regular rules and procedures.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Rolland Lowe, M.D.  James Cole, M.D.  Lars Erickson, M.D.
Past President, San Francisco Medical Society  John Good, M.D.  Randy Yanda, M.D.
Robert Aaron, M.D.  Jeff Sandler, M.D.  Stephen Collins, M.D.
Robert Gross, M.D.  Judy Keeven, M.D.  Lewis Pepper, M.D.
Molly Coye, M.D.  Robert Dickter, D.D.S.  Mark Smith, M.D.
Robert Koshiyama, D.D.S.  Jeffrey Draisin, M.D.  Donald Goldmacher, M.D.
Maureen Katz, M.D.  Gabriel Escobar, M.D.  
Yoshio Nakashima, D.D.S.  Brad Evans, M.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is obligated to ensure that all San Francisco communities have access to medical services. The AIDS crisis brought the health care needs of gay men to the forefront of public discussion. It brought home the importance of a Department flexible and responsive to quickly emerging problems and epidemics, one capable of quickly reallocating resources to dire community needs.

The general health needs of gay men and women, however, are largely unrecognized. The Health Commission will give our community the voice it needs in the health planning processes. It will ensure that the diversity of our City is represented in the consideration of these important issues.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli  Ron Huberman
John Mehring  Richard Alman
Del Martin  Jeff Jones
Donald Cataland  Phyllis Lyon
Cleve Jones  Debra Friedland
Randy Stallings  Roberto Estes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Hispanics in San Francisco strongly support Proposition C, the Health Commission Charter Amendment.

Health is vital to the Latino Community of San Francisco. We are a younger population, with larger families and with special health needs, such as those of Central American refugees. In recent years, federal and state funding for health programs has decreased, leaving community health programs in a difficult financial situation. Recent changes in Medically Indigent Adult services have also negatively impacted our community.

In addition, the need for better and expanded bilingual medical services continues to be a top priority in San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition C.

Celso Ortiz  Roger Hernandez
Rafael Cedillos  Tom Romero
Maria Degado  Raphael Taliaferro
Roberto Hernandez  Juanita DelCarlo
Joanna Devito-Larson  Juan Pifarre
Rosa Maria Clos  Rudolph Mathias
Susan Houston  Ralph Hurtado
Arnell Rodrigues  Alfredo Rivas
P. Braveman, M.D.  Vilma Mendoza
Alfredo Rodrigues  O. Brucker
Sonja Melara  Ray Rivera
Joseph Tanner  Lorenzo Dill
Edgar Quiroz  Yolanda Cameros
Angel Courreras  Monica Asturias

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

The chief opposition to Proposition C comes from two sources: The Chief Administrative Officer and the officials of the University of California Medical Center. The CAO’s opposition is understandable. He simply doesn’t want to lose control of the Health Department and SF General.

UC’s opposition is more puzzling, until you realize that it receives $10–15 million from the City each year for staffing at General Hospital without a publicly reviewed contract! Why is UC afraid of having its relationship with General publicly scrutinized by a Health Commission? Let’s clear the air. Vote YES on Proposition C.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

We support Proposition C.

Fred Ross
James O’Connor
Dale Carlson
Pamela Duffy
Gerald Yoachum
D.J. Soviero
Rosalind Wolf
Gordon Brownell
Jim Wachob
Steven Krefting
JoAnne Miller
Maura Kealey
Margaret O’Driscoll
Nicerita Revelo

Beatrice Patterson
Thomas Ambrogio
Arlo Hale Smith
Dian Blomquist
Thomas Moore
Peter Hanson
Jack Morrison
Mary Vail
Sally Osaki
Linda Post
Terrance Farr
Ken McEldowney
Sue Hestor
Willie Gee, D.D.S.
Agar Jaicks
John Holzclaw

Paul Vacaralli
Al Cassiato
Alan Raznick
James Haas
Al Borvice
Essie Webb
Joan Moulton
Russell Zellers
Stanley Shields
Richard Sevilla
Ann Daley
Dorothy Labudde
Dorice Murphy
Howard Strassner
Mark Davalos
Larry Griffin

Jay Wallace
Rob Waters
Kevin Malone
Jan Holloway
Norman Rolfe
Tom Jones
Barbara Halliday
Sandra Powell
Deborah Sarvis
Esther Marks
James Augustino
Sharon Johnson
Eileen Adams
Ruth Gravanis
Michael Heffer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Community clinics provide thousands of San Franciscans with access to essential primary health care and preventive health services. Yet, these community-based institutions, as well as the neighborhoods and people they represent, have been excluded from participation in health policy decision-making in San Francisco. Excluded, too, is any public debate on alternatives to hospital-based health delivery and financing systems that could prove cost-effective and could better serve the people of San Francisco.

Proposition C, The Health Commission Charter Amendment, offers a forum for public discussion of local health policy issues. By giving the neighborhoods and communities input into health policy decisions, the Health Commission will enable San Franciscans to create a new community of interest and new community of action in the area of health service delivery.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION C.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Commission will be of vital importance to the Asian community. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Dr. Yoshio Nakashima
Louis Hop Lee
Samuel Chung

David Yamakawa
Ernest Wu
Joe Jung
George Suncin
Sophie Wong
Pattie Fong
Willie Gee, D.D.S.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is a key source of medical services in the black community, both directly through General Hospital and the district health centers, and indirectly through community and mental health clinics.

But our special problems—an infant mortality rate significantly above rates in other Bay Area counties, for example—are not often heard by the Department’s policy-makers, for they are insulated and isolated from our community.

Our concerns must be heard if they are to be addressed. Proposition C gives us a platform from which to speak. Vote YES.

Elouise Westbrook
Yvonne Golden
Lorenzo R. Dill
Zuretti L. Goosby, D.D.S
Julianne Malveaux
Eugene Coleman
Naomi T. Gray

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This proposal to put politics into the Department of Public Health by creating a “commission” to direct it is an example of the misguided philosophy of attacking governmental problems by throwing bureaucracy at them. It should be soundly defeated. Currently, the City’s health officials report to one person, the Chief Administrative Officer, who can respond swiftly to any crisis and set consistent policy. The responsibility for the Department lies with the CAO, not a group of political appointees. When our Charter was adopted in 1932, the freeholders explained the rationale of giving the CAO management responsibility over the Health Department. The idea was “to provide reasonable safeguards AGAINST POLITICAL MANIPULATION.” (Emphasis added) Their report stated the office of CAO was designed to be “protected from political influence as largely as possible...” and “it is intended that this officer shall be entirely independent in discharging the function of the office, and particularly, to be free from interference of the mayor, because the latter is subjected to political influence.” Although the Charter was adopted in 1932, its logic still makes powerful sense. Besides blurring lines of responsibility, this iniquitous proposal contradicts health management practices in California and the United States. In fact, the same idea was evaluated in 1971 by a committee established by the supervisors, which concluded that the commission concept, a “seemingly attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another bureaucratic layer in an already cluttered city administrative structure.” To paraphrase The Progress, the Muni is the best proof that “the presence of a commission does not guarantee good management.” Vote NO on Proposition C.

Supervisor 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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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The enactment of Proposition C would set the clock back on health care delivery in San Francisco to the 1920s. As proposed, the measure would almost exactly duplicate the system of Health Care abandoned by The City in 1932 because it had become corrupt, politicized and incapable of effectively responding to the growing challenges of modern health care administration.

In 1973 the Board of Supervisors itself considered and rejected a similar Health Commission option. The board’s reason was that commissions do not make effective management tools. “The Commission, seemingly an attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another layer in an already cluttered City administrative structure.”

The commission concept also goes counter to sound health management practices. Earlier this year, a team of top Bay Area health care professionals was asked to identify the leading municipal hospitals in the country. None of the institutions identified uses a commission form of administration largely because commissions, while perhaps capable of overseeing some urban systems such as mass transit, have proven ineffective and cumbersome.

The argument has been advanced that a commission would allow for greater citizen input into the health department. The fact is that the Department of Health already has some 440 individuals serving on 27 Citizen Advisory Committees—more than with any other city department. The proposed seven member commission would be insufficient in both size, and technical competence to do other than deal with the health care in San Francisco on a “crisis-to-crisis” basis.

As we move into the 21st Century, the administration of San Francisco’s health care systems will only become more challenging. A form of governance that proved inadequate 50 years ago and was rejected by the Board of Supervisors eleven years ago as inappropriate, is not the best way to provide for our city’s health care needs of the future. We urge you to vote “No” on Proposition C.

Dr. Frank Lewis, Chief of Staff, San Francisco General Hospital
Walter Newman, Overseer, UCSF
Yori Wada, UC Board of Regents
Dr. Frank Curry, Former Director of Public Health
Dr. Frank Sooy, Chancellor Emeritus, UCSF
Virginia Leishman, Director of Nursing, Laguna Honda Hospital

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

A vote for Proposition C is a vote to politicize health care in San Francisco. The authors of the 1932 City Charter foresaw this when they abolished the city’s highly politicized seven member health commission and placed the Department of Health under the jurisdiction of the Chief Administrative Officer. Proposition C would return San Francisco to the pre-1932 system of politicized health care management.

In writing the 1932 Charter, the authors recognized the need to balance executive authority by splitting it between the Mayor and the CAO. Departments, such as health, which were thought to be best managed if protected from direct political influence, were placed under the jurisdiction of the CAO, who is appointed for a fixed 10 year term to remove the office from political pressure.

Despite the occurrence of problems the system has worked well. San Francisco General has perhaps the best Trauma Unit in the country. The hospital’s AIDS unit is unquestionably the best and most humane in the nation. Moving control of the city’s health care budget from the Chief Administrative Officer to the Executive will create a “strong mayor” type of government which the Charter was designed to prevent. Health commissioners would necessarily be beholden to the political factions or individuals which lobbied for their appointment and to the mayor who appoints them.

There are alternatives to a Health Commission. Several have already been recommended by a blue ribbon panel of health management experts appointed following the report on General Hospital. We believe these recommendations and perhaps others, including a variation on the health commission concept, deserve further study.

Proposition C would bring about a radical restructuring of government and health care delivery in San Francisco. Both issues are far too important to be decided hastily. We urge a No vote on Proposition C.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, President, Board of Supervisors
Florette White Pomeroy, Consultant
William K. Coblentz, Attorney
Thomas E. Horn, VP, Board of Trustees, War Memorial
J. Gary Shansby, Chairman of the Board, Shaklee Corporation
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission

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

I oppose Proposition C because:
1. It puts the Health Department under the control of politically appointed non-professionals. I cannot agree that this should be done. It brings in politics and throws out expertise.

2. It adds an extra layer of bureaucracy making government more expensive and management more difficult.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Your City Hall representatives would have you believe that by replacing our present Health System with a Health Commission, composed of seven members, at a recompense of $100 per month, will improve the services. Hogwash. Just another layer of government.

With a budget of $270 millions, 5000 employees would you put your faith in the hands of seven and still maintain the same Health Director?

What we need is a clean sweep of the present management; new faces; new ideas. The Charter provides for this, let's do it—"Now," not later.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION C

Marguerite A. Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

By creating a health commission for the Public Health Department, the city of San Francisco would create more problems rather than solve them.

Past experience has indicated a need to separate politics from health care. San Francisco would be turning the clock back to a situation in the 1920s when the city had a seven member commission appointed by the Mayor that oversaw the management of the Public Health Department. The delivery of effective health care was seriously compromised by the politicized department which was a direct consequence of the department's health commission.

For this reason, the citizens of San Francisco at that time passed a charter reform that removed the Health Department from the politically appointed commission and placed it in a newly created Chief Administrative Officer who would be secured against political pressures.

The creation of the Health Commission would take 40% of the budget of the Chief Administrative Officer's budget and place it under the control of a politically appointed Commission, thus negating the intent of the Chief Administrative Officer's Department which was created to administer departments that should be removed from political concerns.

Do not politicize San Francisco's health care. Vote No on Proposition C.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

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

.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, Public Health, and County Agricultural Department; Health Advisory Board; Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the

(Continued on page 82)
Retirement Board Investments

PROPOSITION D
Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?  
YES 261
NO 262

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement Board has complete authority to invest the funds of the Retirement System for city employees. The Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would remove the requirement that the Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California. Instead, the proposition would require the Retirement Board to make investments with the care and skill that a prudent person would make under similar circumstances.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the way the Retirement Board invests pension money. Instead of making only those investments which are legal for insurance companies, the Board would be able to make any investments that a prudent person would make.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Retirement Board to keep making only the same kind of investments which are legal for insurance companies.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-5 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.


Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, increase the cost of government. However, as a result of its authorizing additional flexibility for investments, earnings may be higher or lower than what could have occurred absent this amendment.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 63.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote YES on Proposition D.

The purpose of Proposition D is to clarify the investment responsibility of the Retirement Board and to add language expressly to comply with the recently enacted State Constitutional amendment on fiduciary standards for public pension plans (Proposition 21, June 1984).

Since 1932, the charter has referred to the Insurance Code as the guideline for pension investments.

Insurance Code investment requirements are unsuitable to current pension fund investment practices and severely restrict the ability of the Retirement Board to manage the fund to achieve the best possible investment return for the City and County of San Francisco and the members of the Retirement System.

The added new language will establish firm guidelines for the Retirement Board to discharge its responsibility as the fiduciary for the Retirement Fund. This new language will also serve as increased protection for members of the Retirement System by applying recognized fiduciary standards for which there is considerable statutory and case law.

In summary, the proposed charter amendment serve a dual purpose: it removes obsolete and ambiguous language and brings the Retirement System into compliance with the State Constitution. Both changes will enhance and improve the System's investment capabilities and the ability to achieve its goals and objectives.

Proposition D is endorsed and supported by the Retirement Board and the Board of Supervisors.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This is a worthwhile Charter amendment which updates obsolete and ambiguous provisions on how the Retirement Board can invest funds. It institutes standards consistent with a recent voter-approved amendment to the California Constitution. Investment practices have been refined dramatically in the past 50 years, and income and appreciation choices have increased tremendously. The investment professionals working for the Retirement System now are prevented from making the very most prudent investments possible, and City employees and taxpayers are, thus, prejudiced and hurt.

Present investment rules are based upon the State Insurance Code, which contravenes contemporary investment practices. Proposition D will give more latitude in making high-return investments, but will also retain vigorous guidelines on investment of Retirement System funds while increasing the protection of City employees. It will save money for taxpayers by enabling a better return on Retirement System assets. It's logical. That's why I recommend a "yes" vote.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive, and may continue to receive, benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established. Provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies in California.

The retirement board shall discharge its duties with respect to the system with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with these matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like aims.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________ Apt. # ______
Telephone No. (required) ____________________________
Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): ____________________________
Second choice locations (if any) ____________________________

Signature ____________________________
Surviving Spouse Benefits

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?

YES  264

NO  265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a health care fund for active and retired employees. The City's contribution to this fund equals the average amount contributed to health care funds for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco. The City does not contribute anything for spouses of active or retired employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would provide that the City contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for a least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the health care fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Bill Maher.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs and present membership data of the Health Service System, in excess of $990,000 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 67.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This charter amendment calls for extending a limited measure of aid from the City and County of San Francisco for the health care of the surviving spouse of an active or retired City employee.

Under existing statute, the City and County and its employees, active or retired, share the cost of health care for the employee, their spouse and children. However, upon the death of the employee, the City and County's share of payments to the health care system stops.

Thus, the surviving spouse is compelled to pick up the entire cost for the health care plan while struggling to survive on a reduced family income and, at the same time, contend with ever increasing medical/hospital expenses and everyday living costs for themselves and eligible family dependents.

Proposition E will allow the City and County to continue paying its share into the health care system and not force the surviving spouse and eligible family dependents to assume the entire financial burden for health care payments.

Since the number of surviving spouses affected is very small, less than 1400, the cost to the taxpayer for the City and County is minimal.

The changes proposed by Proposition E should have been made many years ago; it is long overdue. We urge you to support this important measure.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Justice tempered with compassion. VOTE YES. Surviving spouses of City workers receive an automatic 50% cut in retirement pay upon the death of their partners. Why further burden this small group by withdrawing subsidy for health care?

The Retirement System actuary has officially confirmed that the average pension check for this group is $300.00 per month; incidentally, below the nationally quoted poverty level.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by William T. Reed, Chairman Legislative Committee, Retired Employees City & County of San Francisco Helen McAtee, Chairperson Philip Kearney, President, and retired manager of the Health Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Health Service Board which administers the health benefits provided to active and retired employees and their dependents fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the surviving spouse upon the death of a retired employee.

This financial problem is especially acute because a surviving spouse's pension is cut by 50% at the death of the employee and because of the high cost of medical insurance. Medical cost increases have outpaced general inflation rates over the last three (3) years by about two to one.

We urge your "YES" vote on Proposition "E" on the basis of need and equity.

Abraham Bernstein, M.D., President Health Service Board of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Surviving spouses of city employees need this for a relatively comfortable widowhood. Let's extend a small measure of consideration to those who are left on their own.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Proposition E if approved would require the city to subsidize the health premiums of the surviving spouses of non-uniformed city employees. The cost to the city would amount to $990,000 per year and give city employees a benefit that is not normally enjoyed by workers in private industry.

The majority of private employees have health plans that allow surviving spouses to be members of such plans but the employer does not subsidize the premiums of these survivors in any way. Being permitted to join a group plan that provides comprehensive coverage at a reasonable rate is a sufficient benefit in and of itself.

If this amendment is approved it will violate the spirit of the Charter provision that sets city employee salaries and benefits at the average of that which prevails in the metropolitan Bay Area. We believe in fair treatment and compensation for city employees and our current rules provide exactly that.

Vote No on Proposition E.
John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of the average contribution, as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to the average contribution, as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare, provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, 6, 1984 shall be effective July 1, 1973, 1985.
Employee Death Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?

YES 267
NO 268

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, who is a member of the Retirement System is entitled to a death benefit of six months salary if he or she dies, regardless of cause, before retirement. The benefit is paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would provide that if an officer or employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, is injured through external and violent means in the course of employment and the employee dies within 180 days of the injury, an additional benefit of 12 months salary would be paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to pay an additional benefit of 12 months salary to a city employee who dies from an injury caused by external and violent means in the course of employment.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to provide an additional death benefit to these city employees who die from external and violent means in the course of employment.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the number of employees and their respective salary rates which qualify for payment under the provisions of this proposed amendment. Based on experience to date, the cost of this additional amount should not be substantial.”

TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 69.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F provides a small compensation for the survivor of a city employee (non Police or Fire) killed in the line of duty. Let’s agree to this minor expenditure for the survivors of those who have died in city service.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Only rarely is a city employee killed in the line of duty, but death can come with fierce suddenness.

Two Muni workers were crushed by cable car machinery in 1978; the following year, two Water Department employees were murdered at the Lake Merced Pumping Station; and in March 1981, a Hetch Hetchy lineman fell to his death.

For the families of the vast majority of city workers, there is little protection when death comes. Police officers and fire fighters already have special death benefits.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Proposition F is designed to correct a serious inequity on behalf of miscellaneous members of the Retirement System who are killed in line of duty or who die as a result of a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury.

Under current charter provisions, a designated beneficiary of a member who dies in the course of employment from any cause receives the member’s contributions to the system, plus six months’ salary.

Proposition F focuses only on those members who are killed in the line of duty or who die within 180 days from a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury. Beneficiaries of such members will be accorded an additional insurance benefit of twelve months’ salary.

The payment of additional compensation to a designated beneficiary will be subject to the independent hearing officer process as set forth in the City charter.

Proposition F is fair and equitable and, based on actuarial projections, the cost is minimal.

Proposition F is sponsored and endorsed by the Retirement Board, unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, and strongly supported by Mayor Dianne Feinstein.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

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

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

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the Charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.509, 8.510, and 8.520 of this chapter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the Charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the Board of Supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the Board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the Charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

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

(Continued on page 84)
Police Probationary Period

PROPOSITION G

Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?

YES 270
NO 271

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers entering the Police Department serve a one-year probationary period. During the first 32 weeks, the police officer goes through the police training program. After successfully completing training, the officer is then assigned to regular police duties. The Police Department has 20 weeks to evaluate the officer while on regular police duty. After this 20 week period, the probation is complete.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would extend the probationary period of the police officer to one year after the completion of the training. In no event would it extend the probationary period beyond 84 weeks from the date of entry. Any termination for breach of duty or misconduct would require charges and a hearing before the Police Commission.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the probationary period for a police officer to be extended to one year after completing the police training course but not to exceed 84 weeks.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the probationary period for a police officer to remain one year after the date of entry into the department.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

The text of Proposition G appears on page 39.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Your YES vote for this amendment will enable the Police Department to provide more effective police services by ensuring that after officers graduate from the Academy and complete a field training program, an adequate probationary evaluation period exists to determine an officer's fitness to perform police duties. Society demands much from its police officers. As the nature of police work has become increasingly complex, training and performance evaluation functions must meet the needs of an ever-evolving profession.

Great expenditure of time and money are invested in training police officers. Presently, if a recruit is not deemed ready for duty, the probationary period can be completed during any retraining, thus making it difficult and costly to determine ultimate fitness for duty.

By voting YES, you will give the Chief of Police the time necessary to adequately train and evaluate an officer's performance and to better ensure quality police services.

The Police Department has met and conferred with the Police Officers' Association regarding this amendment and has obtained that organization's support for its passage.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Richard Honigso, Supervisor

The Police Chief asked for a longer probationary period because it is needed. Vote yes.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition G.

In recent years, because San Francisco has had the financial strength to do so, we've steadily expanded the size of the Police Department.

It is now the largest ever, with 1987 officers.

More and more officers are being assigned to our neighborhoods on beats and in patrol cars. We want the best officers possible.

That's why Proposition G is so important. It will give the Department greater ability to screen out officers who do not measure up to the strict standards of professionalism this city demands.

Proposition G will extend the probation period for a new officer to one complete year following completion of his or her field training.

Presently, probation starts when an officer is first inducted into the Department, before 12 weeks of class work in the City's outstanding Police Academy and another 14 weeks of field training.

As strenuous as the class work and the training may be, the real test of an officer is on the street.

That's where his or her coolness, competence and compassion—in fact, all the qualities that this city wants in a superior police department—can be observed and tested.

Proposition G will give the Department a full year to evaluate an officer in uniform and on the job.

Those who don't measure up can be dismissed after a departmental hearing. Prop. G will be the City's signal concern that our police officers can truly be described as the City's finest.

Proposition G is a common-sense measure sought by the Chief of Police, that will strengthen the San Francisco Police Department. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Lianne Fenneman, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This is probably the most important proposition on the Fall's ballot, a common sense measure. It deals with the Police Department, which has the ultimate responsibility for the protection of persons and property in our community. It increases the probationary period of police officers by one year. It is intended to ensure that the men and women who protect us are of the highest quality possible. Right now, police officers actually serve only one-fourth probationary period. That's because they spend over 12 months probation in class and training, and only four months in the streets out of the job.

Police commanders need more time to evaluate the officer's "street" performance. Proposition G does that by extending the on-the-job probationary period up to one year. For the sake of our children, neighbors and all San Franciscans, I urge you to vote yes.

Robert L. Kemp, Supervisor
Police Motorcycle Pay

PROPOSITION H

Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?

YES 274
NO 275

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and who are assigned to the Traffic Division get bonus pay. Police officers who ride motorcycles as part of their job, but who are assigned to duties other than traffic, do not get bonus pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would give all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job to get the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want only those San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and are assigned to the Traffic Division to get bonus pay.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current rates of pay, staffing and assignments by the police department, the cost of government would be increased by approximately $74,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Honda Motorcycle Unit of the San Francisco Police Department has, because of antiquated charter language, been denied payment of the hazard pay which is currently given the two-wheel motorcycle officers in the Traffic Division.

Because the primary function of the Honda Motorcycle Unit is crime fighting and not traffic enforcement, the word "traffic" must be deleted from the charter in order to compensate equally all officers who perform hazardous motorcycle duty.

Please join us in voting YES for this very fair charter amendment.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

In 1970, the San Francisco Police Department created a unit of light weight motorcycles to patrol Golden Gate Park and the beaches surrounding the City. In 1977 these duties were drastically changed to counteract rising street crimes around the Western Addition. Neighborhood associations, seeing the effectiveness of the unit, also requested additional patrols by these motorcycle officers. Since 1977 the Honda Unit (as it is known now) has been assigned to virtually every neighborhood in the City to reduce purse snatches, "red light" robberies, drag racing, and street narcotics traffic, along with demonstrations, marches, parades, and sporting events all over the City.

Also occurring since 1977 have been injuries to these highly visible, highly vulnerable motorcycle officers. Some of these injuries include one officer hit head on, and another officer suffering a leg broken by an auto which ran a red light. There have been numerous officers struck by other vehicles causing injuries, and injuries due to other road hazards (oil slicks, pothole etc.). These have increased sharply since the Honda Unit has been assigned to primarily street patrol. One officer was shot twice while patrolling the Western Addition for purse snatches.

It is obvious that these officers are no longer "just" patrolling the parks and beaches as they were initially intended, but are now assigned to patrol the streets of the most crime-ridden areas of the City combating street crimes and enforcing traffic laws. These officers on prior occasions have requested Motorcycle Hazard Pay (which traffic enforcement two-wheel motorcycle officers already receive) for their patrol of these neighborhoods and streets on the two-wheel motorcycles but have been denied because of outdated wording in the Charter. Passage of this amendment would correct this inequity.

Al Casciato
President, S.F.P.O.A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

All police officers who ride motorcycles in the course of duty face special danger and deserve the premium pay already allowed for motorcycle traffic officers.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

A police officer on a two-wheeler is often the first on the scene of a major crime or emergency. Day after day, there is no more hazardous duty for our police.

Whether on a motorcycle in pursuit of a felon on city streets, or on a motorbike on patrol in the remote areas of the City's parklands, an officer lives with danger. Because they can cut through traffic, the two-wheelers often are first to arrive at a shooting or bank robbery or car crash.

The City Charter has long recognized the dangers inherent in this essential police work and has provided hazard-pay for motorcycle officers of the Traffic Division. Proposition H simply extends hazard-pay to the 17 or so officers on the equally perilous motorbike detail.

The amount of money involved is small—only $178 a month for each officer. Proposition H is small recognition of the dangers the police daily face in the line of duty. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Military & Social Spending Initiative

PROPOSITION I

(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?

YES 278
NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco does not have an official position on whether federal taxes should be used for certain kinds of defense spending.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I says the Board of Supervisors must inform the President and certain other federal officials that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether they want their tax dollars used for certain kinds of “excessive military expenditures”, as defined in the measure. Proposition I also says the City’s Chief Administrative Officer must publish an annual report on the amount of federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents, what portion of these taxes are used for military spending, and what portion are used for social or human needs. The Board of Supervisors would appoint a seven-member Citizens’ Advisory Committee to oversee the preparation of the report.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you think federal officials should be told that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending. You also want the City to publish an annual report on how federal tax dollars collected from San Francisco residents are spent.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t think taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending, and you don’t want the City to publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition relating to military and social expenditures had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The proponents of the petition had gathered 12,271 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 2. The proponents are officially listed as G.C. Barnes, L.J. Crowe, H.J. Hobbs and R.A. Wall.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,304 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

74

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time but should not be substantial.”

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I
APPEARS ON PAGE 79.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This initiative should be passed because it educates people about excessive military spending and sends a clear message to the Federal Government that people want a choice as to how their taxes are spent.

Homer Hobbi
Chairperson
The Humane Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why waste taxpayers' money for a handful of misguided individuals?

City government is mandated to govern local citizens, School Board, Law enforcement agencies.

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

Section 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following terms are defined:

(a) Excessive military expenditures: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is destined for research, development, and production of tactical and strategic nuclear weapon research, development, and production of outer space laser-beam technology weapons (popularly known as "star-war" weapons), research, development, and production of chemical and biological weapon military aid, debt over and above, is undemocratic and unnecessary government expenditures that raises the self-human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948 by the United Nations.

(b) Total or common source any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is used for education, housing, defense, and services and without public participation and the public.

(c) Full expenditure any source of the federal budget from any agency or department that is used for education, housing, defense, and services and without public participation and the public.

Section 2. The City Council shall annually report the expenditures of the annual report as the minimum and the average of the annual report, without the full expenditure and the average of the annual report. The annual report shall include the following:

(1) General fund revenue and expenditure for the fiscal year
(2) Full expenditure revenue and expenditure for the fiscal year

Subject to the regulations of the city council, the city council shall provide an annual report that includes the following:

(1) General fund revenue and expenditure for the fiscal year
(2) Full expenditure revenue and expenditure for the fiscal year

(3) Any other information required by the city council

The City Council shall publish the report in the city newspaper and shall make it available on the city's official website and shall publish the report in the city newspaper.
**South African Investment Policy**

**PROPOSITION J**

(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>283</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The City and County of San Francisco has no policy about the investment of pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition J would make it the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco and its agencies not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa. This would be the official policy until Black people are given full political and civil rights by the government of South Africa.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want it to be the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want the City and County of San Francisco to have an official policy against investing pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

---

**How “J” Got on Ballot**

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition on South African investment policy had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot. Julienne Malveaux, the official proponent of the petition drive, had gathered 11,404 signatures which she turned in to the Registrar on August 8.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,520 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “J”**

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

"Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, investment income may be affected in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

---

**Polls are open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M.**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We support removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa because we believe the city of San Francisco should not support the reprehensible institution of apartheid. Non-whites in South Africa are denied freedom of association, freedom of mobility, freedom of speech, and voting rights. San Franciscans support this inequality when city pension funds are invested in companies that do business with South Africa.

This investment is also a very risky investment since any civil unrest in South Africa may lower the value of the investment. Other investment possibilities will equal or exceed current yields on the pension portfolio.

We support this initiative because we support equal rights for all, and because we believe in prudent investment of city pension funds.

San Franciscans for Responsible Investments:
Julianne Malveaux, Chair
Essie Morrien, Co-Chair
Henry Clark, Co-Chair
Arto Hale Smith, Treasurer

Hon. Sala Burton
Hon. Harry Britt
Hon. Doris Ward
Hon. Richard Hongisto
Hon. Nancy Walker
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Louis Hopp Lee
Kim Corsaro
Roberto Hernandez
Bruce St. Cyr
Tim Lennon
Beatrice Eiseman
Joan Apodaca
Wardell Jackson
Susan Englander
Henry Der
Sue Hestor
Ida Strickland
Bradford Paul
Daniel Moses
National Labor Relations Board Union Local 20

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

By supporting Proposition J, San Franciscans join citizens from fourteen other cities, including Washington, D.C., Boston, and Berkeley, in removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa. Our support strikes a blow against the apartheid policy that has denied Black and non-white people equal rights in South Africa.

Removing pension funds from South Africa makes good economic sense. International investment advisors recommend against such investment because of the instability of the South African political situation. Significantly, none of the cities that have divested funds from South Africa have had lower earnings since divestment.

It is both morally just and fiscally sound to vote YES for Proposition J!

Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Economics
S.F. State University
Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud that we were the first state in the nation to vote to sell from our public pension fund portfolio all investments in firms doing business in South Africa. Since the passage of this landmark legislation, it has been our experience that divestiture has not only been a strong moral statement against apartheid, but divestiture has proven to have had no negative impact on our pension earnings.

I urge San Franciscans to give serious consideration to both the moral and the financial arguments as you consider divestiture as a policy of your great city.

Michael Dukakis
Governor, Massachusetts
Submitted by John Burke
South African Investment Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For over a decade individuals and institutional investors, including local and state governments, universities, foundations, churches, Taft-Hartley pension funds and health and welfare plans have refused to invest in, and divested from corporations and financial institutions economically supporting apartheid in South Africa.

They are investing and earning competitive returns in housing, small business, alternative energy, and other socially productive investments which create employment and prevent capital from being exported to South Africa.

It is fiduciary irresponsible to risk beneficiaries' pension assets by investing in companies in South Africa.

Many trade and corporate risk analysts have recommended no investment exposure in South Africa. The Rockefeller Study Commission on U.S. policy toward Southern Africa, recently recommended no new corporate investments in that white, minority ruled country.

Vote to create jobs, housing and small business in your community, not apartheid in South Africa. Vote YES on Proposition J.

John Harrington, President
Working Assets Money Fund

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

"For the sake of the children of all South Africans, black and white, for God's sake, for the sake of world peace, the international community must take action, it must exert pressure on South Africa—political pressure, diplomatic pressure and above all, economic pressure." (Bishop Desmond Tutu, General Secretary-South African Council of Churches, 1981)

The apartheid system continues because of Western support. The South African Council of Churches has said "foreign investors must know they are investing to buttress one of the most vicious systems since Nazism." As members of the international religious community, we can no longer let others make decisions which contradict all that we believe in. We urge San Franciscans to vote yes on Proposition J as a specific, responsible way to express their moral rejection of apartheid.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I support Proposition J and encourage a statewide effort to remove pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

STATEMENT BY UNION OFFICIALS

The United Nations General Assembly declared South African apartheid "a crime against humanity"; and that investment in South Africa "encourages the apartheid policies of that country".

Representatives of several hundred million unionists, meeting under UN-ILO auspices, called for the elimination of stocks of companies investing in South Africa, from pension funds.

As unionists and human rights advocates we support this measure.

Rev. Cecil Williams
Dr. Thomas Ambrogi
Dr. Norman Leach
Rev. Glenda Hope
Rev. Jean Richardson
Rev. Robert Cromey
Rev. Stanley Stefancic
Rev. James Claitor
Rev. Pamela White
First Congregational Church
Rev. Kenneth Westray
Rev. Preliono Walker
Rev. Charles Lewis
Rev. Matthew Fong
Rev. Donald Stuart
Rev. Lloyd Wake

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Lia Belli
Democratic Candidate.
State Senate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON "J"

Committee for International Support of Trade Union Rights
Charles Lamb
Anthony L. Ramos
Jack Goldberger
Curtis Mc Clain
Frank Souza
Stanley M. Smith
Mary Anne Petersen
Timothy J. Twomey
Walter L. Johnson
Jack Henning
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

To protect American interests and to halt the spread of Communist influence into South Africa, responsible action is needed to end legally-required racial segregation and to reasonably extend voting rights.

Proposition J is an important step towards a moderate solution of the South African problem.

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman

Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Todd Roinet
Republican State Senate Nominee
Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

WARNING TO VOTERS

Disregard any self-serving statements by Peter Ashe, Meta Stanley, and their controversial Retirement Board in connection with Proposition J.

The Retirement Board has done more than just aid South Africa by its investment policies.

The Retirement Board has made serious investment errors, produced poor investment yields, and run up market value investment portfolio losses of $160,852,326 (as of 3/30/84) with Prudential-Bache.

One Retirement Board “success” was the purchase of 10,000 shares of Citicorp for $3,473,330. The shares on 3/30/84 were worth $340,000 (90% loss).

Mike Garza
Robert Silvestri
Max Woods

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Rainbow Coalition and all members, support this initiative. Stop investments of San Francisco pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa.

Support Human Rights. People have a right to know that their pension funds are being used to support a racist, repressive, apartheid system that denies basic human and civil rights to 24 million Africans. We have a right to know that a black man can be beaten in the South African penal system for as long as two years for not having identification. That's another reason.

the right to vote, buy or sell land, and the right to live or work where they choose. Support Human Rights. Vote in favor of prop. J.

Galp White
African American of the Rainbow
Rev. Howard Glyde
Northern California Chairman
Rainbow Coalition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco CISPES supports the removal of the pension fund investments from those that profit from apartheid.

The government of South Africa, like the government of El Salvador, denies the people their most basic human rights: freedom from arbitrary arrest and torture; freedom of speech and association; and the right to a decent standard of living.

in 1985. San Franciscans said no to military aid to El Salvador. in 1986, let us say no to investments in South Africa.

San Francisco Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador
South African Investment Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
Apartheid continues to be used to enslave black working people in South Africa. International labor has consistently condemned apartheid, and agrees that divestment from South Africa is an effective means of pressure.

David Aroner, Executive Director
SEIU Local 535
Timothy Twomey, Secretary-Treasurer
Hospital and Institutional Workers
Local 250
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director
United Public Employees Local 390/400
SEIU

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For the Black majority, apartheid in South Africa means no right to vote, unionize or speak out. Those who resist are murdered, tortured and imprisoned. Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, has been imprisoned for over twenty years. Apartheid is fascism!

U.S. companies investing in South Africa profit from low wages paid to Black workers, and play a key role in keeping apartheid alive. Say NO to apartheid and racism—Vote YES on Prop J.

Henry Clark, Candidate for
Congress, Fifth Congressional District
Gloria La Riva
All-Peoples’ Congress
Johnnie Stevens
Southern Africa Freedom Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Joint Council of the Service Employees International Union has unanimously endorsed this proposal. The Union took this action because of the economic oppression of citizens by the South African Government, because of the termination of trade union rights and the arrest of union leaders, and because of the moral “Crime against humanity” of Apartheid.

Timothy J. Twomey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

South African apartheid is condemned the world over. Even the Reagan Administration expresses opposition.

Yet South Africa and apartheid continue to flourish, subjecting all non-whites to the vilest humiliations, discrimination, and exploitation.

San Francisco supports apartheid through our investment of municipal pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. By their very presence there, these companies maintain the status quo. Otherwise, the ruling white minority would not welcome these investments! We allow apartheid to continue, despite all the rhetoric we direct at South Africa.

San Franciscans can make responsible investments elsewhere. Voting YES on J, we join other cities in cutting the taproot—foreign finance—which allows the horrors of South Africa to go on, and on, and on. . . End it! Vote YES, against apartheid!

Executive Committee
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY A PROPOSITION OF ISSUING REVENUE BONDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.312 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $104,000,000 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, FINANCING, IMPROVING AND DEVELOPING WATER DEPARTMENT FACILITIES; AND CONSOLIDATING SAID SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 1984.

WHEREAS, Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the Board of Supervisors in each instance, the Public Utilities Commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities of the San Francisco Water Department subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of Charter Section 7.300, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco by resolution No. 84-0363 adopted July 24, 1984, pursuant to said Section 7.312, has recommended that the Board of Supervisors, by resolution, submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held for that purpose on November 6, 1984, the proposition of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, as it read on June 5, 1984, and Charter Section 7.312 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission in said resolution 84-0363;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

Section 1. A special revenue bond election is hereby ordered and will be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 6, 1984, at which election there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County the proposition of issuing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of providing funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, all as set forth in the following proposition:

Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds

Shall the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to Charter Section 7.312 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing additions, betterments and improvements to the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system, including filtration and treatment works and plants, reservoirs and other water supply, storage and distribution facilities, lands and equipment necessary or convenient for the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system?

Section 2. Said revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 (herein called the "Bonds") are proposed to be issued to finance improvements to an enterprise (herein called the "Enterprise") which is herein defined to be the City and County of San Francisco municipal water supply, storage and distribution systems of the San Francisco Water Department, including all of the presently existing municipal water system of the City and County and all additions, betterments, extensions and improvements thereto. Said existing water system and the proposed improvements thereto shall constitute a single, unified integrated enterprise, and the revenues therefrom shall be pledged to the payment of the bonds. It is hereby found and determined that said municipal water system is necessary to enable the City and County to exercise its municipal powers and functions, namely, to furnish sufficient water for any present or future beneficial use of the City and County.

(a) The purpose for which the Bonds are proposed to be issued is to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, including any expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith.

(b) The estimated costs of the acquisition, construction, financing, improvement and development is $104,000,000. Said estimated cost includes all costs and expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, engineering, inspection, legal and fiscal agents' fees, cost of the revenue bond election and of the issuance of the Bonds, bond reserve funds, and working capital and bond interest estimated to accrue during the construction period and for a period of not to exceed 12 months after completion of construction.

(c) The maximum principal amount of the Bonds proposed to be issued is $104,000,000.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at said special revenue bond election the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution, and designates and refers to said proposition in the form of ballot hereinafter prescribed for use at said election.

(a) Said special revenue bond election shall be held and conducted, and the votes thereafter canvassed and the returns thereof made, and the result thereof ascertained and determined as herein provided; and in all particulars not described by this resolution, said special election shall be held and the votes canvassed pursuant to law for general municipal elections in the City and County and pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 52 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) All persons qualified to vote at municipal elections in the City and County upon the date of the election herein provided for shall be qualified to vote upon the proposition submitted at said special revenue bond election.

(c) Said special revenue bond election is hereby consolidated with the general municipal election to be held in the City and County on November 6, 1984, pursuant to the Charter of the City and County. The precincts, polling places and officers of election for said special revenue bond election shall be the same as those established.
and designated for said general municipal election. Reference is hereby made to the notice of election by the Registrar of Voters setting forth the precincts, polling places and officers of election for said general municipal election, to be published on or about October 15, 1964 for more particular description of said precincts, polling places and officers of election.

(d) The ballot used at said general municipal election and said special revenue bond election hereby consolidated thereunder shall have printed thereon, in addition to all other matters required by law, the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution.

(e) Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

Any voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

If and to the extent that voting machines are used a special revenue bond election such machines shall be so arranged that any qualified voter may vote for said proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "YES" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for said proposition, and may vote against it by pulling down a lever over the word "NO" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote against said proposition. The statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material used in voting machines shall read substantially as follows:

$304,000,000 San Francisco Water Department Revenue Bonds.

Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with law.

Section 1. If the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution shall be authorized by the qualified voters of the City and County by the votes of a majority of all the voters voting on said proposition, the Bonds may be issued and sold for the purpose set forth in Section 2 of this resolution.

The Bonds are to be revenue bonds, payable exclusively from the revenues of the Enterprise and such other funds as may be legally available for such purpose and may be used by the City and County for such purpose without incurring indebtedness. The Bonds are not to be secured by the taxing power of the City and County, and shall be issued under Section 7312 of the Charter of the City and County. The principal of and interest on the Bonds and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof shall not constitute a debt of the City and County, nor a legal or equitable pledge, charge, lien or encumbrance upon any of its property, or upon any of its income, receipts or revenues except the revenues of the Enterprise and any other funds that may be legally applied, pledged or otherwise made available to their payment. The Bonds, if authorized, shall be special obligations of the Public Utilities Commission and shall be secured by a pledge and shall be a charge upon, and shall be payable, as to the principal thereof, interest thereof, and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof, solely from and secured by a lien upon the revenues of the Enterprise and such funds as may be described in the resolution authorizing the issuance of the Bonds.

The Bonds shall not constitute or evidence indebtedness of the City and County but shall constitute and evidence only an indebtedness of the Public Utilities Commission payable solely out of revenues received by the Public Utilities Commission from San Francisco Water Department facilities operated or controlled by it. The Bonds shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in Section 5.401 of the Charter.

Section 2. This resolution shall be printed in the voter's pamphlet and mailed to each registered voter pursuant to Section 5.108 of the Charter of the City and County.

TEXT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C, Continued from page 16

Surplus current supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the Purchasing Agent, who shall be appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the Department of Public Works and shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works. The director of public works shall be appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works, who shall be a deputy director of public works for engineering, a deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director.

The director of public works shall designate a deputy or other employee to perform the duties of an engineer. Said deputy shall possess the same power and duties as an engineer and shall be subject to the same duties and restrictions as an engineer.

The office of the Chief Administrative Officer shall include the function of personnel services, including the administration of personnel policies, and shall be in charge of and administered by the deputy director of personnel services. The deputy director of personnel services shall have the same powers and duties as the director of personnel services and shall be subject to the same restrictions as the director of personnel services.

In addition, the office of the Attorney General shall include the function of personnel services, including the administration of personnel policies, and shall be in charge of and administered by the deputy director of personnel services. The deputy director of personnel services shall have the same powers and duties as the director of personnel services and shall be subject to the same restrictions as the director of personnel services.

The office of the Chief Administrative Officer shall include the function of personnel services, including the administration of personnel policies, and shall be in charge of and administered by the deputy director of personnel services. The deputy director of personnel services shall have the same powers and duties as the director of personnel services and shall be subject to the same restrictions as the director of personnel services.

The office of the Chief Administrative Officer shall include the function of personnel services, including the administration of personnel policies, and shall be in charge of and administered by the deputy director of personnel services. The deputy director of personnel services shall have the same powers and duties as the director of personnel services and shall be subject to the same restrictions as the director of personnel services.

The office of the Chief Administrative Officer shall include the function of personnel services, including the administration of personnel policies, and shall be in charge of and administered by the deputy director of personnel services. The deputy director of personnel services shall have the same powers and duties as the director of personnel services and shall be subject to the same restrictions as the director of personnel services.

The office of the Chief Administrative Officer shall include the function of personnel services, including the administration of personnel policies, and shall be in charge of and administered by the deputy director of personnel services. The deputy director of personnel services shall have the same powers and duties as the director of personnel services and shall be subject to the same restrictions as the director of personnel services.
traffic safety education;

(b) to receive, study, and give prompt attention to complaints relating to street design or traffic devices or the absence thereof;

(c) to collect, compile, analyze and interpret traffic and parking data and to analyze and interpret traffic accident information;

(d) to engage in traffic research and traffic planning; and

(e) to cooperate for the best performance of these functions with any department and agency of the city and county and the state as may be necessary.

The department shall submit to the traffic bureau of the police department, for its review and recommendation, all proposed plans relating to street traffic control devices; provided, however, that the bureau may waive submission and review of plans of particular devices assigned by it. Failure of the said traffic bureau to submit to the department its recommendation on any proposed plan within fifteen (15) days after receipt shall be considered as automatic approval of said traffic control. The department shall not, with respect to any traffic control devices, implement such plan until the recommendation of the traffic bureau has been reviewed or until the fifteen (15) day period has lapsed.

Department of Electronics, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporateness may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the public or fire service or electronic system of the city, provided upon paying the sum in connection and the use of the same, provided that the department shall require the approval of the chief of the department of police and fire what are not exceeded or otherwise the proper and efficient operation of the system in which the connection is made. The condition upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid thereon shall be fixed in the event of supervision or regulation upon the recommendation of the chief of the department.

The city administrative officers shall have power to appoint and to remove an essential director of public health for the public service, who shall be responsible for the administrative and business management of the institutions of the department of public health, including, but not limited to the hospital, lunatic asylum, hospital, and shall be in charge of the police-provided, that the director of public health is present to approve the appointment of any person, who shall be responsible for the administrative and business management of the institutions of the department of public health.

The city administrative officers shall appoint a general manager of the public service facilities management department the building and office of the premises. The general manager shall be responsible and accountable for the facilities management department and the building and office of the premises. The general manager shall be responsible and accountable for the facilities management department and the building and office of the premises.
health professionals and others whose "primary current activity" is the provision of patient care or the administration of facilities or institutions which provide patient care. The term of each member of the commission shall be four years, commencing at twelve o'clock, noon, on the 15th day of January in the year 1985; provided, that the respective terms of office of those first appointed shall be as follows: two for four years, two for three years, two for two years, and one for one year. Vacancies occurring on said commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of each of said members shall be filled by the mayor. No commissioner may serve more than two consecutive terms or a total of eight years.

The compensation of each commissioner shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month. The commissioners shall annually elect one of their members president. They shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the governance of the commission.

3.696 Director of Public Health; Other Executives

The health commission shall appoint a director of public health who shall serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The director of public health shall be a regularly licensed physician in the State of California, with not less than five years' experience in public health administration immediately preceding his or her appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician requirement may be waived by the health commission. The director of public health shall be the chief executive of the commission and shall, subject to the approval of the commission, manage all operations under its jurisdiction. The director shall have power to appoint and remove a deputy director for operations, a deputy director for community health programs, an administrator for San Francisco General Hospital and an administrator for Laguna Honda Hospital. The administrator of San Francisco General Hospital and of Laguna Honda Hospital shall have power to appoint and remove associate administrators to the extent such positions are created by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

These positions shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter and shall be held by persons who possess the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the divisions and institutions of the department. However, any person who has civil service status in any of the above positions on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have such status under the civil service provisions of this charter. All positions in the department legally authorized shall be continued and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.697 Powers and Duties

The health commission shall manage and control the city and county hospitals, emergency medical services, and all matters pertaining to the preservation, promotion, and protection of the lives, health and mental health of the inhabitants of the city and county, except where this charter specifically grants that power to another department. It may also determine the nature and character of public health nuisances and provide for their abatement.

The commission shall inspect the sanitary conditions of the municipal institutions of the city and county, including jails and all public buildings; of the disposition of the dead; of the disposition of garbage, offal and offensive substances.

The commission shall be a policy-making and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in section 3.500 of this charter. The commission shall have the power to establish and make appointments to advisory committees as it shall deem necessary.

8.107 Suspension and Removal

Any elective officer, and any member of the civil service commission, health commission, or public utilities commission or school board may be suspended by the mayor and removed by the board of supervisors for official misconduct, and the mayor shall appoint a qualified person to discharge the duties of the office during the period of suspension. On such suspension, the mayor shall immediately notify the supervisors thereof in writing and the cause therefor, and shall present written charges against such suspended officer to the board of supervisors at or prior to its next regular meeting following such suspension, and shall immediately furnish copy of same to such officer, who shall have the right to appear with counsel before the board in his defense. Hearing by the supervisors shall be held not less than five days after the filing of written charges. If the charges are deemed to be sustained by not less that a three-fourths vote of all members of the board, the suspended officer shall be removed from office; if not so sustained, or if not acted on by the board of supervisors within thirty (30) days after the filing of written charges, the suspended officer shall thereby be reinstated.

The mayor must immediately remove from office any elective official convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, and failure of the mayor so to act shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part.

Any appointee of the mayor, exclusive of civil service, health, recreation and park, and public utilities commissioners, and members of the school board, may be removed by the mayor. Any nominee or appointee of the mayor whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, except the chief administrative officer and the controller, as in this charter otherwise provided, may be removed by a majority of such board and with the concurrence of the mayor. In each case, written notice shall be given or transmitted to such appointee of such removal, the date of effectiveness thereof, and the reasons therefor, a copy of which notice shall be printed at length in the journal of proceedings of the board of supervisors, together with such reply in writing as such official may make. Any appointee of the mayor or the board of supervisors guilty of official misconduct or convicted of crime involving moral turpitude must be removed by the mayor or the board of supervisors, as the case may be, and failure of the mayor or any supervisor to take such action shall constitute official misconduct on his or their part.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT.

PROPOSITION F — Continued from page 69

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

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

"Compensation convertible" shall mean the compensation as determined by the re-
The compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection 2(f) of this section shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this subsection 2(b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this subsection 2(b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said subsection 2(f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of sixty-five years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty years, computed under subsection 2(g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth above his age at retirement taken to the preceding completed calendar year, for each year of service, computed under subsection 2(g).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed seventy-five percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection 2(g) of this section may elect to receive the reduced equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him through his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including but not limited to the manner and method, and upon such other terms and conditions as the board of supervisors may from time to time prescribe.
each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

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

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

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

(1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection E (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within one hundred eighty days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

F (f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system.
provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least ten years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000), he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety (90) days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, ninety (90) days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement.

Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus one and two-thirds (1 2/3) percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon death of such member prior to retirement his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to the estate of designated beneficiaries.

§ 4 (c) The following clause shall be included in the compensation of: (a) employees, and (b) members of the retirement system: and for the use of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

(1) Time during which said members of the retirement system are elected and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of service as a municipal officer or employee.

(2) Service in the line of duty of department which is entitled to receive compensation for service as a municipal officer or employee.

(3) Contributions based on time in service in the line of duty of department which is entitled to receive compensation for service as a municipal officer or employee.

The contributions based on time in service in the line of duty of department which is entitled to receive compensation for service as a municipal officer or employee shall be paid to the estate of said member and shall offset his or her contributions in service.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.20.

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

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

(1) There shall be credited to each member of the retirement system, under section 8.30, equal to seven and one-half (7 1/2) percent of such member's average final compensation.

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

(a) The city or county shall contribute an amount equal to seven and one-half (7 1/2) percent of such member's average final compensation.

(b) The contributions based on time in service in the line of duty of department which is entitled to receive compensation for service as a municipal officer or employee shall be paid to the estate of said member and shall offset his or her contributions in service.

(3) Contributions made by said member to the retirement system shall be subject to the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection H (b), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), subsection H (b), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in equal installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section and proportion to the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later time of a periodic terminal valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits hereunder by each member under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then calculated by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective members after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be paid to the estate of said member, but such amounts shall be subject to the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

The total contributions, with interest thereon, made or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the bene-

ficial under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contrib-
ute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection H (b), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), subsection H (b), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in equal installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section and proportion to the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later time of a periodic terminal valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits hereunder by each member under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then calculated by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective members after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be paid to the estate of said member, but such amounts shall be subject to the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.
made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision 5 (a), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of thirty years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

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

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

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

(e) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections B (b), (c), F (f) and (f) (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(M) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendments of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.584-5 Death Benefit

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

(a) If no benefit is payable under Subsection B (b) of this section:

(1) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(2) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(b) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Section 8.584-2, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years.

If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subsection (b), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subsection (b) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subsection (a) of this section, the amount of said benefit payable under Subsection (a) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subsection (b) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

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

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

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

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this section, any allowance payable under this subdivision (b) shall be reduced by the amount of the benefit paid to such other person. Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

Upon the death of a member after retirement, an allowance, in addition to the death benefit provided in the immediately preceding paragraph, shall be paid to his surviving spouse, until such surviving spouse's death or remarriage, equal to onehalf of his retirement allowance as it was prior to optional modification and prior to reduction as provided in subdivision (g) of Section 8,149 of this charter, but subject to the part of such allowance which was provided by additional contributions. For allowance, however, shall be paid under this subdivision (b) to a surviving spouse unless such surviving spouse was married to and member at any time prior to his retirement. If such retired person leaves no such surviving spouse, or if such surviving spouse should die or remarry before the child of such deceased retired person attains the age of 18, the allowance which such surviving spouse would have received had he or she lived and not remarried shall be paid to the retired person's child of like age, either to one person, or in such manner as the board of supervisors shall prescribe.

The following is a sample of the text of the proposed amendment to the charter as included in the proposed amendment to the charter on November 6, 1945. The text is intended to be the final and complete version of the proposed amendment to the charter.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION 6**

NOTE: Additions or substitutions in italics. Deletions are indicated by strikeout.

**2.34 Dismissal During Promotional Period**

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a promotional period. The civil service commission shall not establish a promotional period of more than six months, and shall not continue for any person more than twelve months.

Any person qualifying for an appointment under this section shall serve a promotional period of twelve months or, in the event of a vacancy, until his replacement. Any person appointed under this section shall serve a promotional period of twelve months or until his replacement.

Any person who fails to complete the promotional period shall be dismissed from his permanent position. Any person who fails to complete the promotional period shall be dismissed from his permanent position. Any person who fails to complete the promotional period shall be dismissed from his permanent position.
duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in §3531 of this Charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers of the police patrol officers classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in §106 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month now provided in §106(b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean “compensation earnable” as used in §8.549.

The term “police officers or protective officers” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol officer on military leave, as defined by §8.361 of this Charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may award any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in §8.549.

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid to each of the following: firemen firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall
be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen firefigher classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen firefighters classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordnance for firemen firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter. For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firemen" "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective rate of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, police officers or firemen; firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uni-
formed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975–76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT VOTING

You can vote for any candidate, regardless of party. This is a General Election and you can vote for any candidate on your ballot. Political party restrictions only apply at Primary Elections (in June).

Do not vote for more than the authorized number of candidates or none of your votes for that contest will be counted. Most candidate contests specify "Vote for one" but you can vote for up to six supervisors and up to four School and College Board members. If you make a mistake and vote for more than six candidates for supervisor you can get a replacement ballot.

If you move, you must re-register. The most common complaint we get on election day is that someone can't vote because they have moved and not re-registered. If you have moved, your name will probably not be on the rolls anymore and even if it is, it is not legal to vote using your old polling place (except in certain rare circumstances). Next time you move, don't leave your vote behind; remember to re-register.

You don't have to be sick or out-of-town to get an absentee ballot. Any voter can request an absentee ballot for any reason, or for no reason. To become a "permanent" absentee voter you must be disabled but ordinary absentee voters do not have to have a reason.

Your registration will not necessarily be cancelled if you don't vote but chances of that happening will increase if you don't vote. After the election, we will send a postcard confirming the address of all nonvoters. If the Post Office or the current resident says you don't live there anymore, your registration will be cancelled. No one is automatically cancelled for not voting at any election.

It is not necessary to re-register before each election. Your registration is permanent and will remain in effect until you move, die or are convicted of a felony.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

A 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將選票插入。

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.

B 第二步
請確認將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，適合於二紅點之上。

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 perfone con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

C 第三步
請把選票之選舉針，由票孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

D 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，有空白格預為投票人應用。
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ______________________________________

Address ______________________________ Apt. # _____

Telephone No. (required) ________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) __________________________

Signature ___________________________________________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

By signing below, I certify that I am a permanent absentee voter.
Por el presente firmando, certifico que soy un votante ausente permanente.

Date

Date-Fecha: ____________________________

EXTRA APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Since this page would have been blank anyway, we have used the space to reprint an extra copy of the absentee ballot application form.

Your "real" absentee ballot application appears as a postcard inserted into this book. We would prefer that you use the postcard form because it is easier to process and less likely to get lost.

If two persons in your household are requesting absentee ballots, you may put both postcard forms into an envelope in order to save postage.

The disabled may apply as permanent absentee voters by completing the little box at the bottom of the form. Disabilities that qualify for permanent absentee status include circulatory problems and mobility impairments as well as more severe disabilities.

If you have not yet received your absentee ballot, then you are probably not on our permanent absentee mailing list. The permanent absentee voters' ballots were mailed out the week of October 9th.
JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
558-3061

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

GENERAL ELECTION

5th Congressional District
3rd Senate District
19th Assembly District
(No BART)

BALLOT TYPE
19 1

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
8400's

Application for absentee ballot appears on Page 48
Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席連票申請表刊在第48頁

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
November 6, 1984
General Election
Compiled by Jay Patterson
Registrar of Voters
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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Kevin Starr .......................... 34
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Dave Wharton ....................... 36

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION
Dick Cerbatos ........................ 37
Christopher Christenson ............. 37
Libby Denebeim ...................... 38
George Dykstra ...................... 38
Martin Eng .......................... 39
Dr. Eugene S. Hopp .................. 39
terry K. Hugunin ..................... 40
James Legare ........................ 40
JoAnne Miller ....................... 41
Benjamin Tom ....................... 41

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala ................. 42
Rev. Amos C. Brown .................. 42
Patrick Fitzgerald ................... 43
Dean Goodman ....................... 43
Andre Pehargou ...................... 44
Julie Tung .......................... 44
Moy Velasquez ....................... 45
Dr. Timothy Wofred ................. 45

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (if applicable)
All Candidates ...................... 21

PROPOSITIONS
PROPOSITION A
Would authorize issuance of $42.5 million in Port revenue bonds.
Analysis ......................... 46
Arguments ........................ 47–51
Legal Text ....................... 51

PROPOSITION B
Would authorize issuance of $104 million in Water Department revenue bonds.
Analysis ......................... 52
Arguments ........................ 53
Legal Text ....................... 81, 82

PROPOSITION C
Would remove Health Department from CAO jurisdiction and place it under a commission appointed by the Mayor.
Analysis ......................... 54
Arguments ........................ 55–61
Legal Text ....................... 82–84

PROPOSITION D
Would change the standards under which the Retirement System makes investments.
Analysis ......................... 62
Argument ........................ 63
Legal Text ....................... 63

PROPOSITION E
Would extend employee health benefits to surviving spouses.
Analysis ......................... 65
Arguments ........................ 66, 67
Legal Text ....................... 67

PROPOSITION F
Would give additional death benefit to employees killed on the job.
Analysis ......................... 68
Arguments ........................ 69
Legal Text ....................... 69, 85–89

PROPOSITION G
Would increase the probationary period for new police officers.
Analysis ......................... 70
Arguments ........................ 71
Legal Text ....................... 89

PROPOSITION H
Would grant motorcycle premium pay to all two-wheel motorcycle police officers.
Analysis ......................... 72
Arguments ........................ 73
Legal Text ....................... 89–92

PROPOSITION I
Would require CAO to monitor military and social expenditures by Federal government and produce annual report.
Analysis ......................... 74
Arguments ........................ 75
Legal Text ....................... 75

PROPOSITION J
Would declare an official policy of not investing City pension funds in companies doing business in South Africa.
Analysis ......................... 76
Argument ........................ 77–80

CREDITS
The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a non-partisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Roberta Boroganovlo, Stephanie Saltier and Susan Kwock. They were assisted by Thomas Toomey of the City Attorney’s Office.
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or, after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfora una balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escribe el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SÍ" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請在投票紀錄器上之打孔器在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知：

選票上所選擇的任何其他候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投票的候選人打孔，但不要超過要選舉的限定人數。

選票合格的非候選人，請在非候選人選票信封所提供的預定位置上蓋上該候選人所競選的職位和候選人姓名。

選票任何塗抹，請在選票上箭頭所指 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若有黏着污點或水溼者，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔错了，撕滿或弄濕了，選票作廢，非候選人候選人的選票信封，應把該選票送回選區的監選員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PRÓXIMA PAGINA
### President and Vice President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. MONDALE</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALDINE A. FERRARO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BERGLAND</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES A. LEWIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB RICHARDS</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN KENNEDY SALAMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMA WONG MAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### United States Representative 5th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK, Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(There is no contest for State Senator in this District)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal.)

本區沒有州參議員選舉。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</th>
<th>STATE SENATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td>19th District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ROBERT SILVESTRI, Republican    | 71            |
| County Central Committeeman     |               |
| Miembro, Comité Central del Condado |           |

| LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic      | 73            |
| Member of the Assembly          |               |
| Miembro de la Asamblea         |               |
### Member, Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE RENNE</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Political Scientist / Educator</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIANNE MALVEAUX</td>
<td>Economics Professor / Writer</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN L. MOLINARI</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUBY T. JIMENEZ</td>
<td>Directory Sales Representative</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW “DADDY ANDY” JONES</td>
<td>SPCC Student</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY BRITT</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANDALL BRONNER</td>
<td>Artist, Musician</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONATHAN BULKLEY</td>
<td>Architect / Neighborhood Planner</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGER BOSCHETTI</td>
<td>T.V. Ethnic Producer</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>KEVIN STARR</td>
<td>Businessman, Communicator, Professor</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>商人，信息員，教授</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>CAROL RUTH SILVER</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>現任市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>DAVID C. SMITH</td>
<td>Administrator, Service Agency, Escritor, Movimiento Socialista</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>服務機構行政管理員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>JOHN E. WAHL</td>
<td>Attorney, Abogado</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Writer, Socialist Action, Escritor, Movimiento Socialista</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>作家，社會主義活動家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Community Service Attorney, Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>社區服務律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Administrator, Administrador de Servicios de Salud</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>衛生行政人員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>ROBERT D. INGRAHAM</td>
<td>Political Consultant, Consultor Político</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>政治顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>ELEANOR M. DAVIS</td>
<td>High-Tech Business Woman, Mujer de Negocios / Campo Tecnológico</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>高級工藝女商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td>Management Consultant, Consultor Administrativo</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>行政管理顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>WILLIE B. KENNEDY</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors, Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician, Musico</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>音樂家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP</td>
<td>Attorney, Member, Board of Supervisors, Abogado / Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>律師／市參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>JOHN SALEH ABDULLA</td>
<td>Real Estate Salesman, Vendedor de Bienes y Raíces</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>實業拓銷員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>SUZANNE ALBERTO</td>
<td>Administrative Secretary, Secretaria Administrativa</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>行政秘書</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPORTANT:**
There are two (2) pages of candidates for Supervisor.
(29 candidates, vote for 6)

**NOTE:**
29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DICK CERBATOS</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education, Miembro, Junta de</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educacion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON</td>
<td>Supervisor, Muni Railway, Supervisor, Tranvías</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBBY DENEBEIM</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE DYKSTRA</td>
<td>Community Services Director, Director de Serv</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>icios Comunitarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>Motor Truck Operator, Conductor de Camiones</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>Parent and Teacher, Maestra y Madre de Familia</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consult</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ant, Contador Público / Consultor Financiero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>Consultant, Consultor</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE S. HOPP</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE F. PEHARGOU</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOS C. BROWN</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM WOLFRED</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST &quot;CHUCK&quot; AYALA</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN GOODMAN</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>CLEAN WATER BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $325,000,000 to provide funds for water pollution control, water conservation, and water reclamation projects and activities.</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE CLEANUP BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for hazardous substance cleanup.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $75,000,000 to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $650,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SENIOR CENTER BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $50,000,000 to provide funds for senior centers.</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS EXCLUSION. Empowers Legislature to exclude from property tax reassessment certain newly constructed fire protection improvements. Fiscal Impact: If implemented, estimated local government property tax revenue losses of less than $5 million annually, state government increases in costs to compensate for local school district property tax loss, and state government increases in income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SUPREME COURT. TRANSFER OF CAUSES. REVIEW OF DECISIONS. Modifies existing constitutional provisions regarding transfer of causes and review of decisions. Fiscal Impact: No significant effect.</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO LOS VOTANTES PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA LIMPIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $325,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para control de la contaminación del agua, conservación del agua y para proyectos y actividades de recuperación del agua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>LEY ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar el desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoría de las escuelas públicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA LIMPIEZA DE SUBSTANCIAS PELIGROSAS. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para limpiar el medio de las substancias peligrosas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA POTABLE SALubre DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $75,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la mejoría de los sistemas de agua domésticos para cumplir con las normas mínimas de agua potable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $650,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA CENTROS PARA PERSONAS DE EDAD MAYOR DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $50,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para centros para personas de edad mayor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE LOS SISTEMAS DE PROTECCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS. Otorga poder a la Legislatura para excluir del recaudo del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas mejorías recientemente construidas para protección contra incendios. Impacto fiscal: De ser llevada a cabo, pérdidas en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad para los gobiernos locales calculadas en menos de $5 millones anuales, además aumentos en los gastos del gobierno estatal para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida en impuestos a la propiedad, y aumentos para el gobierno estatal en los ingresos provenientes del impuesto a la renta debido a menores deducciones en los impuestos a la propiedad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>CORTE SUPREMA. TRANSFERENCIA DE CAUSAS. REVISIÓN DE DECISIONES. Modifica las disposiciones constitucionales en vigencia en cuanto al traspaso de causas y la revisión de decisiones. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto significativo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT. DISABLED PERSON. Authorizes Legislature to postpone property tax payments on owner occupied principal residence by disabled person. Fiscal Impact: State expenditures estimated to be less than $2 million annually which would be recovered, with interest, when the homes are sold.

PROPERTY TAXATION. HISTORIC STRUCTURE EXCLUSION. Excludes from property tax reassessment certain new construction on owner occupied principal residence historic structures. Fiscal Impact: Local governments property tax revenue loss of less than $100,000 annually. State government expenditure of about 32% of this to compensate local school districts for property tax revenue losses.

(Proposition 35 has been withdrawn from the ballot)

TAXATION. Amends Proposition 13 adding restrictions on real property taxation, new tax measures, and charging fees. Provides specified tax refunds. Fiscal Impact: State revenues reduced at least $100 million, net, over first two-year period. State costs increased up to $750 million over first two-year period and by about $150 million annually in subsequent years to replace revenue losses to schools. Local agencies other than schools property tax and other revenue losses of about $2.8 billion, net, over first two-year period and of about $1.1 billion annually in subsequent years.

STATE LOTTERY. Establishes state-operated lottery. Revenue use: prizes, 50%; expenses, not more than 16%; public education, at least 34%. Fiscal Impact: Cannot be predicted with certainty. Estimated yield for public education would be about $500 million annually, with less the first two years. Estimated division: K-12, 80%; Community Colleges, 13%; California State University, 5%; University of California, 2%.

VOTING MATERIALS. ENGLISH ONLY. Requires Governor urge federal officials amend law so that voting materials be printed in English only. Fiscal Impact: Insignificant.
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POSTERGACIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. PERSONAS INHABILITADAS. Autoriza a la Legislatura a posponer los pagos del impuesto a la propiedad sobre una residencia principal ocupada por su dueño quien sea una persona inhabilitada. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales calculados en menos de $2 millones anuales los cuales serían recuperados con intereses, cuando las residencias sean vendidas.

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE ESTRUCTURA HISTÓRICA. Excluye del recaudación del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas construcciones o trabajos nuevos efectuados en residencias que son estructuras históricas ocupadas por sus dueños como el principal lugar de residencia. Impacto fiscal: Pérdidas para los gobiernos locales en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad de menos de $100,000 anuales. Gastos gubernamentales estatales alrededor del 32% de esta suma para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida de ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad.

La Proposición número 35 no será usada en esta elección.

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. Enmienda la Proposición 13 añadiendo restricciones en la fijación de impuestos a la propiedad inmueble. Nuevas medidas de impuestos y honorarios a cobrar. Dispone reembolsos especificados de impuestos. Impacto fiscal: Reducción en los ingresos estatales en por lo menos $100 millones netos, durante el primer periodo de dos años. Aumento en los costos estatales de hasta $750 millones durante el primer periodo de dos años y en unos $150 millones anuales en años sub siguientes para reemplazar la pérdida de ingresos para las escuelas. Pérdidas para otras agencias locales, además de para las escuelas, del impuesto a la propiedad y otras pérdidas de ingresos de alrededor de $2.8 mil millones netos durante el primer periodo de dos años y de alrededor de $1.1 mil millones anualmente en años sub siguientes.

LOTERÍA ESTATAL. Establece una lotería operada por el estado. Uso de los ingresos: premios, el 50%; gastos, no más del 16%; educación pública, por lo menos el 34%. Impacto fiscal: No puede ser predicho con certeza. El rendimiento que se calcula para la educación pública será de alrededor de $500 millones anuales, siendo menor los dos primeros años. División que se calcula: jardín de niños al 12º grado, el 80%; universidades de la comunidad, el 13%; Universidad Estatal de California, el 5%; Universidad de California, el 2%.

MATERIALES DE VOTACIÓN, INGLÉS SOLAMENTE. Requiere que el gobernador use a los oficiales federales que emiendan la ley para que los materiales para votación sean impresos en inglés solamente. Impacto fiscal: Insignificante.
### REAPPORTIONMENT
Provides reapportioning Senate, Assembly, Congressional, Equalization districts for 1986 and subsequent elections by new commission composed of former justices. Fiscal Impact: Commission costs of up to $3.5 million before 1986 election. Costs of $10,000 to $20,000 each to relocate an unknown number of district legislative offices. County costs of about $500,000 for 1986 election materials. County savings of about $300,000 in 1986 for printing costs, and $200,000 every two years thereafter. Future reapportionments will probably cost less than under existing law.

#### CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS
Limits contributors and contributions to elective state office candidates. Opposition candidate's personal expenditures matched by limited public funding. Fiscal Impact: Reduce state revenues by about $100,000 each fiscal year and increase state expenditures by approximately up to $1,650,000 each fiscal year.

### PUBLIC AID, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
Creates Public Assistance Commission. Limits benefit expenditures to national average plus 10%. Legislative amendments permitted. Fiscal Impact: Net effect would be combined state and county expenditure reduction beginning July 1, 1986. Size of reduction and impact at different levels of government impossible to determine. Substantial reductions under specified programs would be partially offset to an unknown extent by increased costs under other programs and reduced tax revenues resulting from reduced federal expenditures within the state. Likely, state expenditures would be reduced and county expenditures increased.

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REDISTRIBUCIÓN. Dispone redistribución para los distritos del Senado, Asamblea, Congreso y de la Junta de Revisión de Avalúos para 1988 y para las elecciones sucesivas mediante nueva comisión compuesta de estados unidos para 1982, impuesto fiscal. Consta de comisiones de hasta $3.5 millones antes de la elección de 1988. Costos de $10,000 a $20,000 cada uno para un máximo de $500,000 para materiales para la elección de 1988. Ahorros para el costo alrededor de $300,000 en 1988 por costos de impresión y $200,000 cada dos años de allí en adelante. Las redistribuciones futuras probablemente costarán menos que bajo la ley actual.

CONTRIBUCIONES PARA COMPAÑÍAS. Limita a los contribuyentes y contribuciones a candidatos a cargos políticos electivos, iguala con fondos públicos limitados los gastos personales del candidato a oposición. Impuesto fiscal: Reduce los ingresos estatales en costos del $100,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal. Reduciría el aumento de gastos estatales en aproximadamente $1,850,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal.

AYUDA PÚBLICA, PROGRAMAS DE ASISTENCIA MÉDICA. Creación de Asistencia Pública. Limita gastos de beneficio al promedio nacional más el 10%. Permite enmiendas legislativas. Impuesto fiscal: el efecto estará la reducción de los gastos del $100,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal. Los gastos de gastos estatales reducirían el grado de descentralización mediante el aumento de gastos en otros programas y por ingresos de impuestos reducidos que resultan de gastos federales reducidos dentro del estado. Es factible que los gastos estatales serían reducidos y que los gastos de condados aumentarían.

**PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO**

A: Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión del Puerto a emitir $42,500,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la construcción y mejoras de las instalaciones portuarias?

B: Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir $104,000,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones para el departamento de Agua?

C: Deberá crearse una Comisión de Salud que consista de siete miembros nombrados por el Alcalde para dirigir y controlar los hospitales de la Ciudad y el Condado, y los demás servicios de salud del Condado, y para nombrar un Director de Salud Pública?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES 261</th>
<th>NO 262</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and Black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Código</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
<td>Respuesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Jubilaciones a hacer inversiones de los fondos de jubilación como persona prudente en lugar de hacer inversiones de carácter legal para compañías de seguros?</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Ciudad subvencionar al cónyuge sobreviviente de empleados activos o retirados de la misma manera que la Ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o retirados en el Sistema de Servicios de la Salud?</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagar un beneficio de doce meses de salario por fallecimiento a diversos oficiales y empleados que mueren como resultado de lesiones físicas externas y violentas durante el transcurso y periodo de empleo?</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Deberá el periodo probatorio para oficiales de policía extenderse de un año a partir de su entrada a un año después de haber completado el entrenamiento pero sin exceder ochenta y cuatro semanas?</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagar un salario adicional a los miembros del Departamento de Policía asignados a prestar servicio en todas las motocicletas de dos ruedas?</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>(Ordenanza de Iniciativa): Debería San Francisco solicitar al Gobierno Federal que pregunte a los contribuyentes de impuestos si desean que una parte de sus impuestos se use para un excesivo gasto militar y si desean que la Ciudad publique un informe anual sobre los impuestos federales recaudados en San Francisco y sobre la parte usada para propósitos militares excesivos y la parte usada para necesidades sociales?</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>(Declaración de Norma): ¿Deberá ser la norma de San Francisco que ningun fondo de pensión administrado por la ciudad sea invertido en empresas que tienen intereses comerciales en Sudáfrica hasta que sea abolida la segregación racial y se otorgue a la población de raza negra plenos derechos políticos y civiles en Sudáfrica?</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

Nota: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto 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 voto completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

STEP 2
BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

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 perfure con el la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

STEP 4
AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 9, 1984.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election, such as this one, you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot.

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

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature, Supervisors, B.A.R.T., College Governing Board and Board of Education.

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

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

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 6, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 6, 1984.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

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

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

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 25 through 41 because in June the numbers were 16 through 24.

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

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

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

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

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

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
"IT APPEARS TO BE ONE END OF THE NOVEMBER 7 SAN FRANCISCO BALLOT..."

Reprinted by permission of the San Francisco Chronicle.

(Because there are no BART candidates in your district this page would otherwise have been blank.)
Candidates for Supervisor

JOHN SALEH ABDULLA
My address is 2533 Folsom Street
My occupation is Licensed Real Estate salesman
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: I graduated at a local public high school. I also attended private business schools. I am presently a licensed real estate salesman.

Knowing the city’s acute housing and employment problems, I am deeply concerned of the these problems and would like to be in a position to find solutions to these problems. While I have no immediate solutions; if elected, I promise the people of San Francisco that I will devote all of my time to finding solutions to these problems by utilizing all resources available to public officials in solving these problems.

John Saleh Abdulla

SUSANNE ALBERTO
My address is 25 Pinto Avenue
My occupation is Administrative Secretary
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I am a Hispanic-Filipina (English/Spanish-speaking) administrative-secretarial San Francisco worker and Muni commuter and have been a resident voter since 1968.

I believe San Franciscans would be better served if suitable inquiry and evaluation preceded passage of locally needed and desired legislation and tax revenue expenditures to assure anticipated results. San Francisco’s Charter permits supervisory inquiry into expenditures. I strongly support thoroughly researched legislation and tax revenue use to benefit the peoples of San Francisco.

All of my sponsors know me to be a capable, persistent fighter for principles and public benefit and believe I would be an excellent supervisor.

The sponsors for John Saleh Abdulla are:
Saleh M. Abdulla, 155 Clipper St., Janitor
Sam Bachman, 238 Eddy St., Janitor
Richard F. Bourdon, 165 Clipper St., Mover
Peter Bury, 555 Post St., Musician
Freddie Cononico, 1419 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Alfred Catalin, 1459 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Bernard Fabian, 3609-18th St., Deputy Clerk
Robert Fulgham, 487 Joost St., Business Representative
Saleh M. Ghanem, 155 Clipper St., Maintenance
Stephen A. Halbe, 1202-23rd Ave., Musician
Janal Jawad, 488 Ellis St., Business Owner
Zelma Ann Johnston, 575 O’Farrell St., Retired
Barbara D. Jones, 1421 South Van Ness Ave., Housewife
Alfred E. Kelly, 610 Polk St., Retired Union Official
Yhiya S. Muhamed, 640 Eddy St., Maintenance
Brian Charles Percy, 335 Hyde St., Payroll clerk
Charles Ridgell, 347 Lexington St., Business Representative, Janitors Union
James Roy Sellers, 575 O’Farrell St., Unemployed
Madeline Smith, 159 Clipper St., Housewife
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect

The sponsors for Suzanne Alberto are:
L. J. Alberto, 4156-25th St., Communication Technician
Alvin E. Bernstein, 6 Roanoke St., Computer Analyst
David Carlton Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Tape Librarian
Sarah M. Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Programmer/analyst
Rose Violet Deseo, 215 Niagara Ave., Retired Bookkeeper
Dorothy D. Dunlap, 125 DeMofftort Ave., Telecomm Specialist
R. L. Feather, 111 Inverness St., Secretary
Angel Fernandez, Jr., 1419-11th Ave., Security Officer
David L. Fors, 26 Shields St., Janitor
Paul F. Garm, 2387-44th Ave., Security Guard
Joyce A. Glynn, 38 Serrano Dr., Legal Secretary
Margery M. Gray-Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Financial Administrator
Amy J. Koehler, 2006 Fell St., Office Manager
Cheryl Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Housewife
Cherylene Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Welder
David Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Truck Driver
Ruth Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Housewife
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St., Custodian
Dewey W. McNeill, 251 Topeka Ave., Utility Engineer
Leon Medina, 1725 Church St., Retired-Laborer
Nathan Nemer, 125 Combon Dr., Retired-Produce Buyer
Patricia J. Powell, 2006 Fell St., Publishing
Petty Randall, 366 Wilde St., Grocery Clerk
Roberto Sampere, 328 Staples Ave., Sr. Drafter
Clifford C. Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Mechanic
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Clerical
E. L. Thomason, 111 Inverness St., Student
Kenneth E. Tucker, Jr., 243 Hahn St., Building and Grounds Patrolman

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

ROGER BOSCHETTI
My address is 20 Carnelian Way
My occupation is Television Producer, Host, Writer, and Labor Consultant
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of involvement with working men, women, and young people, and as a concerned citizen, I will work to implement laws which will benefit all the people of San Francisco, such as reducing payroll and business tax, so as to encourage small businesses to come or stay in San Francisco, thereby creating more jobs. Will implement constructive changes in muni for speedier, safer and effective service, I will also create better programs to help the needs of our young men and women, I would like more police foot patrol, and more affordable housing, with more concern for our senior citizen

RICHARD BRADLEY
My address is 1 Ardath Court
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As a supporter of the Spartanist League I twice tore down the Confederate flag of slavery which flies no more in Civic Center. The American Civil War did not complete its historic mission. It will take a third American revolution, a socialist revolution, to liberate black people.

Spoke Reagan’s anti-Soviet war plans and union-busting austerity drive by mass strike action! U.S. imperialism—hands off Central America! Smash Klan/Nazi terror through labor/black action! Break with Democrats—enemies of labor/minorities! Build a workers party that will stop at nothing short of socialist revolution and a workers government!

The sponsors for Roger Boschetti are:
William A. Arieta, 16 Wheat St., Police Officer
Rita M. Belli, 1558 Greenwich St., Assessment Clerk
Rachel Boschetti, 20 Carnelian St., Comestologist
George Contesi-Turner, 631 O’Farrell St., Instructor/Professor
Bernard M. Crotty, 2971-23rd Ave., City Employee
John E. Downey, 83 Gaviota Way, Nationally Known Referee/Limo Driver/Boxing Judge
Curtis Elliott, 350 Glenview Dr., Doorman
Evelyn C. Fitzgerald, 230 Stonecrest Dr., School Administrator
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Dr., Labor Consultant
Roberta Jacobs, 1438-38th Ave., Business Agent
Roger Micheli, 2653 Chestnut St., Goldengate Disposal
Robert T. Moore, 2130 Larkin St., Lieutenant S.F.P.D. Retired
Shirley Robin Moore, 1210 Larkin St., Investigator
Marie G. Neilson, 315 Maynard St., Businesswoman
Marie Ann Perri, 80 Malta St., Corporate Secretary
Joseph J. Phillips, 1203 Clayton St., Attorney
John A. Rucci, 1354 Broadway, Lawyer
Don L. Rotan, 134 Gilbert St., Writer
Samuel Smith, 297 Allison St., Seaman Cook
Carmen Solis, 59 Majestic Ave., Restaurant Owner
Rose M. Tarantino, 160 Country Club Dr., Housewife
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
John J. Vidal, St., 1437 Judah St., Office Manager
Winston Wong, 225 Anzavista Ave., Manager of American Cab Co.
Herman W. Young, 210 Brookdale Ave., Seaman
Maya Dhillon-Zygal, 455 Chenery St., Homemaker

The sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirtham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Gritsch, 265B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff B. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikemagi, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Donnyse Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

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

HARRY BRITT
My address is 783A Guerrero Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: As a full-time Supervisor, I’ve worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making city government respond to our needs.
- I’ve supported crime-reducing neighborhood patrols to protect seniors;
- fought to repeal the sewer service charge;
- worked to protect the quality of our neighborhoods and environment;
- secured funding for anti-gay violence programs, AIDS prevention, community arts programs;
- sponsored protections for renters and small businesses from skyrocketing rents;
- worked to create affordable housing;
- sponsored equal pay for comparable jobs;
- worked to have downtown pay its share of taxes;
- worked to save jobs when companies moved from San Francisco.

Harry G. Britt

The sponsors for Harry G. Britt are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Sala Burton, 8 Sloan Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman
John L. Molinar, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister, Community College Board Member
Gina Mascione, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Member, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everst St., Performing Arts Administrator
Yuri Wada, 56-4th Ave., Regent-University of California
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner, Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., President, Harvey Milk Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., President, Alice B. Toklas Club
Wayne Friday, 1095-14th St., Newspaper Political Editor
Tom Murray, 4715 Balboa St., Newspaper Editor
Thomas F. Waddell, M.D. 141 Albion St., Athletic Games Organizer
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Affordable Housing/Tenant's Rights Worker
Edward L. Peets, 350 Arballo Dr., Senior Citizen's Advocate
John Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Sierra Club
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus
Leon Bruschera, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Howard Floyd, 553 Noriega St., Minister
Andrea Jepson, 1334 Masonic Ave., Nuclear Freeze Leader
Philip E. De Andrade, 601 Mississippi St., Small Business Owner
Georgianna Lynn; 165 El Verano St., West Portal Avenue
Business Owner
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon St., Registered Nurse

RANDALL DWAYNE BRONNER
My address is 1390 Market Street
My occupation is artist-musician
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: San Francisco Budget Surplus-$162 Million.
Muni Fare/Fast Pass Revenue-$46 Million.
Aspen, Colorado-Free buses ten years.
Portland-Free buses downtown.
We residents pay for more than two thirds of Muni's cost in our taxes. Residents should ride Muni for free!
You must check out the murals supporting Peace in Central America on Balmy Street.
Please call 864-8641 if you'd like to meet the survivors of 1906, free, at the Great Earthquake Exposition.
If you want to brighten up your street call San Francisco Street Gardeners for free cuttings, succulents, and flowers, at the same number.

Randall Bronner

The sponsors for Randall Bronner are:
Selig R. Raphael, 405-32nd Ave., Survivor 1906 Quake
Jane Domnacker, 9 Central Ave., Reporter
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
William T. Witter, 948 Haight St., Artist
James T. Lyon, 1761 Page St., Musician
F. Kelly Hartin, 119 Margaret Ave., Cateress
Julie Tancil, 1653 Washington St., Waitress
Raymundo E. Pena, 1470 Fulton St., Waiter
Mary L. Martinez, 295 Moscow St., Secretary
Sandra Renzi, 861 Post St., Waitress and Prep Work
Giorgio Irving, 1390 Market St., Waiter
Martin James, 1139 Broadway, Bartender
Elizabeth Kelly, 3247 Pierce St., Restaurant Services
Anthony R., Parrinello, 312 Precita Ave., Artist
Carlos Gonzalez, 3409-20th St., Community Worker
Robert Burns, 2548 Folson St., Carpenter
Susan Cervantes, 358 Precita St., Artist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folson St., Student
James A. Lewis, 3030 Cabrillo St., Artist/Teacher
Julianne Malveaux, 26 Winfield St., Economist

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

JONATHAN BULKLEY

My address is 147 Tenth Avenue
My occupation is Architect, Neighborhood Planner
My age is 54

My qualifications for office are: Experienced Architect and Planner. President, Planning Association for the Richmond; Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. Member: Open Space Committee, Mayor's Task Forces for Parking, Mechanical Amusement Devices and Sidewalk Displays.

My Architecture / Planning background will help me respond to the need for a coherent vision of San Francisco as a City that works for everyone.

My priorities include:
- Housing for those most in need—singles, working women, seniors.
- Crime-free streets
- Civil service preference for San Francisco residents.
- Caring solutions to seniors' needs.
- Eliminating Bay pollution.
- Maintaining Neighborhood Character, Diversity, and Liveability.

The interests of San Francisco Residents will always come first!

Jonathan Bulkley

The sponsors for Jonathan Bulkley are:

Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Tenant Representative, Rent Stabilization Board
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., S.F. Housing Commissioner
InaDearman, 217 Upper Ter., Former City Planning Commissioner
Lee Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor; Former Supervisor
Jose Luis Fernandini, 464-43rd Ave., Businessman; Vice President, MAPA
Russell B. Flynn, 2610 Filbert St., President, Rent Stabilization Board
Ann Fogelberg, 2980 Vallejo St., Housewife; Vice Pres., Cow Hollow Association
Terry Francois, 20 Taraval St., *Attorney; Former Supervisor
Louis J. Girado, 435 Magellin Ave., Public Utilities Commissioner
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer
Ruth Gravanis, 74 Mipah St., Glen Park Association
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Port Commissioner; Past President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
John Hooper, 201 Buena Vista East, Conservationist; President, Buena Vista Neighborhood Ass'n.
Don Horanzy, 84 Kellogg Ave., Former Supervisor
John H. Kirkwood, 1635 Green St., Member, BART Board
Bill Kahns, 4215-26th St., Co-Chair, Open Space Committee
Lin P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner
Richard Livingston, 380 Eddy St., Administrator, Realty House West; Member, Open Space Committee
Peter McCrea, 1024 Lake St., Businessmen; Past Pres., Public Utilities Comm.
Amy Meyer, 3627 Clement St., Rec. & Park Commissioner
William F. O'Keefe, Sr., 444 Corbett Ave., President, S.F. Taxpayers Association
Thomas R. Peretti, 3787-16th St., Banker; President, C.R.I.R.
Alan Raznick, 237 Topaz Way, Attorney; President, Coalition for S.F. Neighborhoods
Toby Rosenblatt, 3409 Pacific Ave., Businessman; Pres., City Planning Commission
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
Sam Valentino, 500 College Ave., Retired; Past President, Mary's Park Improvement Club

DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I am a supporter of the Spartacists, the labor/socialists who put a stop to flying the Confederate flag, banner of KKK racism and slavery, in Civic Center. Finish the Civil War! Forward to a workers government!

Without socialist revolution catastrophe threatens mankind. We need an integrated workers party that will take the productive wealth from the capitalist bosses, and establish a workers government and socialist planned economy.

Spoke Reagan reaction through mass strikes! Military victory to Salvadoran leftists! Defend the USSR! No support to Democrats—liberal party of imperialism! Smash Taft-Hartley! Labor's gotta play hardball to win!

Diana Coleman

The sponsors for Diana Coleman are:

Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Richard Bradley, 1 Ardath Ct., Maintenance Building
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikagami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 223-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennnye Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ELEANOR M. DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street

My occupation is Computer Accounting Services

My qualifications for office are: My experience with community groups and City Hall is extensive.

Involved in local politics through neighborhood and merchant associations, worked on campaigns for Diane Feinstein, and many others. Served the community through the following organizations: Vice President, Clement Merchants, head of legislative committee; Consultant to Polk Merchants; Member, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Roundtable, Vice Chair Health Committee; Board, California Alcohol Treatment Services; Chairperson Alcohol Awareness; Appointee, Mayor’s Task Force on Sidewalk Vending, Parking; San Francisco Outlook, Project Manager; Member, SPUR; Boardmember Public Research Institute, SFU.

A loyal devotee of San Francisco. I will serve honestly with an open mind and heart.

Eleanor M. Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor M. Davis are:

Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
Robert R. Bacel, 2478-23rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Rachael Balyeat, 2233 Hyde St., Investor
Luis A. Belmonte, 250 Walnut St., Real Estate Developer
Mildred Burrell, 2970 Pine St., General Contractor
Leslie A. Burton, 1528 Baker St., Attorney
Rose Cassano, 863 Carolina St., Artist
Toni Delacorte, 2025 Hayes St., Public Relations Executive
Catherine J Dodd, 61 Deming St., Registered Nurse
John Richard Doyle, 108-12th Ave., Attorney at Law
Adrien Belli Falk, 1000 Green St., Housewife
Rory A. Flood, 1070 Revere St., Owner, Fine Furniture Company
Patricia Hooper, 382 Arkansas St., Writer
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman and Library Commissioner
Paul Raynor Keating, 180-4th Ave., Attorney at Law
Dennis E. Kirtley, 1344 Larkin St., Manager of Gift Shop
Beatrice Kochner, 35 Presidio Ter., Attorney at Law
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Ted R. Moulton, 17 Leroy Pl., Architect
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Owner, Data Processing Company
Kenneth E. Rowell, 1319-5th Ave., Engineer
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Liquor Store Owner and Chairman of Parking Authority
Robert L. Strauss, 1734-9th Ave., Graduate Student
Debbie Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner
Larry Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner

EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES

My address is 695 John Muir Drive

My occupation is Banker

My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: Forty-four years after my grandparents were married here in San Francisco just seven months after the nineteen hundred and six earthquake. A beautiful blond hair, blue eyed baby boy came bouncing out of St. Joseph's Hospital. Studying economics at St. Mary's College after attending Riordan and then leaving religious life to create a conservation newspaper. Trying to educate local residents about the serious problems that we faced here in San Francisco and the bay area. If allowed to fulfill my dreams of what we can accomplish I will gladly give twenty-five per cent of my salary to charity.

Edward Michael Hayes

The sponsors for Edward Michael Hayes are:

Edwin B. Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Miriam Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Agnes Cassidy, 385 Day St., Retired
Anna M. d'Ottillie, 1556 Dolores St., Housewife
Bertram J. d'Ottillie, 1556 Dolores St., Retired
Mary M. Driscoll, 342-28th St., Administrative Assistant
John L. Flynn, 54 Seaview Terr., Banker
Elaine M. Gilloran, 133 Randall St., Banker
Rae Grubsticck, 2479-40th Ave., Banker
Marcia Kocel, 44 Mallorca Way, Bank Clerk
Berniece Langley, 460 Duncan St., Retired
Bernadine K. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William G. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William D MacGilfroy, 2720-35th Ave., Banker
Michael J McCarthy, 3744-22nd St., Retired
Nora S. McManus, 456 Duncan St., Retired
Ellen McSweeney, 457 Duncan St., Retired
Aileen F. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Mary C. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Leona P. Parker, 56 Harper St., Housewife
James L. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Clerk
Janet M. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Secretary
Rita M. Phipps, 230 Prospect Av., Retired
Eugene F. Sullivan, 456 Duncan St., Ironworker
Catherine C. Tassone, 1795 Sanchez St., Clerk
Nellie Twomey, 1352 Church St., Homemaker
Seymour Whitelaw, 3150 Clay St., Investment Broker
Ann M. Willis, 1365 Dolores St., Housewife

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

ROBERT DANIEL INGRAHAM

My address is 1637 Noriega Street
My occupation is Political Consultant
My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: Over one hundred years ago two great men, David Broderick and Edward Baker, gave their lives to save this Republic.

I ask you voters to compare these two San Franciscans with the small minded politicians of today.

Pathetic Wendy Nelder says “Fluoride causes AIDS”; degraded Willie Brown corrupts us with “Oh What a Night” baccharalia; Feinstein lusts for higher office, and the rest are worse.

San Francisco can play an historic role in the development of the Pacific Basin. But you, our citizens, must decide. I urge you: Join with me and other candidates of Lyndon LaRouche’s NDPC in our fight.

Robert Daniel Ingraham

The sponsors for Robert Ingraham are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graziela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Forklift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative

RUBY T. JIMENEZ

My address is 961 Delano Avenue
My occupation is Directory Sales Representative
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: A San Francisco resident since, 1948 and a naturalized American of Mexican decent, I consider myself an earnest interpreter of human needs for the Hispanic community and other minorities. Misinterpretations, injustices, lack of communication and mutual respect must be addressed and aired. These human needs for minorities and others can be solved if we end the current world depression. The humane world economic policies of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly his proposal for joint economic development between the United States and Ibero-America (Operation Juarez) can end this depression. The port of San Francisco should be expanded to become a strong world trade center.

Ruby T. Jimenez

The sponsors for Ruby T. Jimenez are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graziela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Stanley J. Bolinski, 1909 Eddy St., Staff Clerk
Willa W. Coleman, 215 Munich St., Sales Representative
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
Patricia L. Hardy, 178 Broad St., Assistant Manager
Patricia Helton, 93 Prenties St., Teacher, Mission Community College
Andrea Konviser Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ona Lee Jones, 359 Orizaba Ave., Pharmacist
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Manager Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Fortillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozzaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ANDREW ("DADDY ANDY") JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Criminology Student
My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I have been a respected citizen and server of San Francisco for 25 years. I am involved in many community organizations that care for our community such as Glide church, Red Cross volunteers and the Siegel partents resource center. I’ve been appointed to sit on the board of such organizations as “Mission Coalition, Mission Model Neighborhood and the Mission Education program, (appointed by Mayor Alioto and Mayor Moscone).” I’d like to dedicate my Supervisory campaign to a few of the many people who helped me over the years, Chef Roy Hammerich, Betty Romenoff and the Mission Childcare Consortium.

Andrew Daddy Andy Jones

WILLIE B. KENNEDY

My address is 950 Duncan Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: In my three years as Supervisor, I have worked to maintain and improve the unique quality of life we have in San Francisco—from rent control to fighting for parks and open spaces. I honor our rich diversity of cultures and life styles through support of neighborhood preservation and the rights of all groups—from children to seniors.

I initiated a campaign to control the tragic increase in child abuse; and am working hard on the problem of decreased employment, particularly for youth.

I want to continue serving your interests in making this the most liveable city in the United States.

Willie B. Kennedy

The sponsors for Willie B. Kennedy are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Elected Official, Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor/Airport Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney At Law
Harry G. Britt, 785-A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman St., Member, Board of Education
Handy Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant, Commissioner PUC
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Union Official
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Lin P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Aldo P. Lera, 1177 California St., Electrical Contractor
Cyril Maginn, 1 Nobhill St., Philanthropist
Bill Maher, 69 Eslie St., Supervisor
James McCray, Jr., 164-6th Ave., Mayor
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Prectica Ave., Administrator
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
Adolph Schuman, 1170 Sanamento St., Businessman
Stan Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Nancy G. Walker, 555 Green St., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilmar St., Member
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board

The sponsors for Andrew (Daddy Andy) Jones are:

Stephen Harold Irvine, 2037 15th St., Carpenter
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Joseph A. DeCarlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Chairperson of MHD
David L. Butler, 983 Shotwell St., Salesman
Diane Moananu, 43 Watchman Way, Graduate Student
David Levinson, MD, 2927 Folsom St., Physician
Helen Butler, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife
Joseph A. Macellari, 989 Shotwell St., Retired Cashier
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Archbishop
Rose Sillard, 10 Lucky St., Housewife
John Maras, 20-12th St., Student
Donald Strickland, 981 Shotwell St., Musician & Carpenter
Juanita Del Carlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Hiring Hall Director
Oscar Herrera, 360 Holyoke St., Educator
Delmar T. Burge, 142 Central Ave., Professional Musician
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Jesse V. Valencia, 751 Castro St., Job Developer
Peter Anthony Rivera, 57 Peters Ave., Counselor
Fernando Costo, 177 Johnston Dr., Executive Director
Miguel Quinones, 24 Bachelor Ave., Social Worker
Harry W. Madison, 4917 Folsom St., Appliance Repair
Paul Sussman, 1234 Third Ave., Housing Finance
Carmencita L. De la Cruz, 2763 Bryant St., Accountant
Kathryn M. McCamant, 635 Scott St., Tenant Organizer
Lynne Bee, 215-28th Ave., Grants Coordinator
Harry E. Baker, 1345 Clement St., Project Coordinator
Candidates for Supervisor

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 121 Golden Gate Avenue
My occupation is Musician
My qualifications for office are: I am one of many in unity with San Francisco's diversity. I "Keyes" will open doors for you, to: homes, jobs, health care, better schools, provide more: complimentary fine arts, concerts, veterans benefits, senior services; close doors on pornography, drugs and prostitution; clean our streets and make them safe once more; eliminate wasteful spending and lower your taxes. For reasons like these, I am your "Keyes". Never again, will any San Francisco go wanting, while "special interest" lick their fingers. Let us shine bright, the city that knows how, a guiding light to world peace now.

God help us.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys are:
Gary Gene Adams, 139-5th Ave., Plastic Fabricator
Wayne Austin, 391 Leavenworth St., Job Developer
Brian Chew, 354-50th Ave., Restaurant Worker
Ginger Coyote Coleman, 734 Bush St., Editor of Punk Globe
Hugh T. Dauley, 1177 California St., Computer Operator
Thomas A. Finney, 165 Turk St., Disabled/SSI
Howard M. Grayson, 160 Eddy St., Community Coordinator, Hosp, House
Louis J. Gwerder, 427 Valley St., Laborer
Mickey C. Helmel, 777 Tehama St., Patriot
John R. Hess, 554 Broadway St., Doorman
Kevin M. Kennedy, 250 McAllister St., Social Worker
Patricia E. Kerman, 1026 Montgomery St., Film Maker
John Lyman, 149-6th St., Musician
Patrick Marsh, 231-27th St., Chef
Perry V. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Teacher
Michelle Miller, 15 Surrey St., Student
David M. Moebus, 350 Frederick, Symphonic Musician
Keith F. Moore, 1233 Guerrero St., Controller
Gary Posner, 443 Broadway St., Engineer
Steven Presant, 373 Ellis St., Security Officer
Clark Sullivan, 765 Ellis St., Political Activist
Tina Tatoo, 646 Ellis St., Office/Clerical
Robin Vega, 1330 Sutter St., Courier
H. Joseph Wagner, 121 Goldengate Ave., Musician
James E. Washington, Jr. 55 Mason St., Consultant, Arts and Science
Guy West, 640 Polk St., Broadcasting
Linda Marie White, 777 Tehama St., Seamstress

DAVID L. KILBER

My address is 1901 Noriega Street
My occupation is Management Consultant
My age is 40
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of Oregon State University, a Vietnam Veteran, and a former candidate for California State Assembly. I have resided in the Sunset district with my wife Susan for five years.

I stand for a strong defense policy including the Beam Weapon anti-missile defense and the technology boom this new "Apollo" program will bring to the local economy.

San Francisco must become a center for science, classical culture, and trade, bringing blue-collar families and industry back to this city. We must expand the Port of San Francisco and launch the Pacific Basin development strategy proposed by economist Lyndon LaRouche.

David L. Kilber

The sponsors for David L. Kilber are:
Carlos Altamirano, 730 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 730 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 2256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Forklift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elora Hardy, 143 Farallon St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capitanio Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Stanines, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
Edith Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retired
J.G. Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retailer

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

QUENTIN L. KOPP

My address is 68 Country Club Drive
My occupation is Attorney/Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: Local government is us, because we depend upon it to provide essential services and wise leadership. For 13 years I've fought to cut governmental waste and excessive taxation, to keep government honest and on its toes. My efforts have already saved taxpayers over $250,000,000 and I'm proud to be the one supervisor who watches how every dollar is spent. This year City government will spend an average $4,500,000 a day, every day. I want to continue my role as your "financial watchdog" in City Hall and add a needed balance to the Board. I would very much appreciate your support.

Quentin L. Kopp

The sponsors for Quentin L. Kopp are:
Joseph L. Aioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Former Mayor
John J. Barbargelata, 15 Lorenzo Way, Former Member of the Board of Supervisors
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Attorney at Law
Sala Burton, 8 Storie Blvd., Member of Congress
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Businessperson
Robert C. Elkins, 406 Magellan Ave., Attorney at Law
George Evankovich, 1600-A Greenwich St., Labor Representative
Terry A. Francisco, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Jack E. Frankel, 72-22nd Ave., Rabbi
Merla Zellerbach Goerner, 225 Presidio Ter., Author/Journalist
Robert E. Gouzailes, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Attorney at Law
Carleton Goodlett, 2606 O'Farrell St., Publisher
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author/Retired Publisher
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Golde Kaufman, 2900 Pacific Ave., Homemaker/Volunteer
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070-26th Ave., Congressional Assistant
Joseph P. Lacey, 801 Stockton St., Teacher
John Lo Schiavo, 2130 Fulton St., Priest/Educator
Haig G. Mardikian, 2960 Divisadero St., Businessman
Frances M. McAlister, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired President of City Employees
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Bob Ross, 420-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Harriet C. Salaro, 95 Crestlake Dr., Self Employed
Businesswoman
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Police Commissioner
Dorothy Volsch, 177 San Aldo Ave., Housewife/Volunteer
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo Drive
My occupation is Political Scientist/Educator
My age is 29

My qualifications for office are: impressive. A full decade of political activism at national, state, and local levels. Leadership roles in labor, housing, and education. To illustrate my seriousness in leading our City, I have launched the following initiatives campaigns:
* A 3-year rent freeze
* Commercial rent control
* A balanced budget
* Expedition of labor disputes
* Driver-ownership of taxicabs
* An outdoor stadium in front of Moscone Center

As your supervisor, I will pursue:
* District elections for district councils
* Metro services for the Richmond, Marina, Bayview
* Higher police standards
* More schools and parks

You need me now, San Francisco! Who else you gonna call?

Julian O. Lagos

The sponsors for Julian Lagos are:
Charles Martin Adams, 54 4th St., Cab Driver
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 577 Arballo Dr., Psychologist
Elizabeth Alvarez, 1262 La Playa St., Sales
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall St., Computer Consultant
Elizabeth Beneford, 508 Andover St., Attorney
Katherine Bobrowski, 417 Stockton St., Unemployed
Thomas J. Callan, 17 Sutro Heights Blvd, Consultant
James D. Cantor, 742 Treat Ave., Station Attendant
Henry Conserra, 1258 40th Ave., Professor
Leon Datangel, 725 Van Ness Ave., Businessman
Peggy L. Dickson, 320 Monticello, Student
Mark Emery, 555 Taylor St., Artist
James Michael Fayle, 1360-B Page St., Tenant Advocate
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore St., Videographer
Ken Johnson, 42 Kellogg St., Cabdriver
Vincent B. Latimer, 4118-A 24th St., Service Manager
Richmond Loewenson, 1341 Valencia St., Writer
John B. Loretti, 905 Columbus Ave., Cab Driver/Fisherman
Bernice Martin, 506 Church St., Public Stenographer
Jonathan Mc Cardy, 80 Alvarado St., Attorney
Victor E. Miller, 1341 Valencia St., Editor
Steven A. Scheinman, 1301 20th St., Attorney
William F. Taylor, 1890 Clay St., Operating Engineer
Frank S. Warner, 2530 Fillmore St., Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 249 Cotter St., Legal Worker

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

JULIANNE MALVEAUX

My address is 26 Winfield Street
My occupation is Economics Professor/Labor Specialist/Writer
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan and former White House staffer (1977-78) Dr. Julianne Malveaux (pronounced “Mal-Voh”) is an elected California State Central Committee woman who is committed to a diverse San Francisco:
—San Francisco Tomorrow Board Member
—Booker T. Washington/Ella Hill Hutch Board Member
—Strong Supporter: Mondale-Ferraro
—Steering Committee, San Francisco Plan Initiative
—Delegate candidate for Jesse Jackson
—Former staff, President’s Council of Economic Advisors
—Ph.D. (Economics, MIT)
—Co-author of three books
—Columnist, San Francisco Sun Reporter
—Priority focus: job creation programs for youth, minorities, and women
—Author, 1984 Ballot Proposition J which prohibits San Francisco pension fund investments in South Africa.

The sponsors for Julianne Malveaux are:

June C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
Judith Brecka, 609 Kansas St., Lawyer, City Commissioner
Randall Bronner, 1390 Market St., Artist/Musician
Rene Cazenave, 2821-22nd St., Housing Advocacy
Terence Faulkner, 2371 42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Thomas C. Fleming, 2171 O’Farrell St., Journalist
Jerry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Margaret A. Gannon, 3649-18th St., Attorney
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Yvonne S. Golden, 1743-9th Ave., School Administrator
Peter M. Good, 709 Shrader St., Arborist
Robert Y. Hernandez, 852 Moultrie St., Director, Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer
Doris W. Kahn, 3259 Clay St., Transportation Commissioner
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Michael Koblenz, 825 Masonic Ave., Distributor
Orelia Langston, 55 Friendship Way, Senior and Geriatric Specialist
Arthur Latham, 2350-88th Ave., Personnel Administrator
Michael C. Miller, 1920 Quint St., Attorney
Jack D. Morrison, 4 Woodland Ave., Management consultant
Carl Dillow Reece, 204-46th Ave., Graduate Student
Ruth Gordon Schnapp, 726-23rd Ave., Structural Engineer
Frances M. Shaktan, 329-32nd Ave., Consumer Rights Advocate
Anita Silvers, 15 Otsego St., Professor, S.F. State
Arlo Smith, 66 Fernando Way, District Attorney
Bruce M. StCy, 343 Chester Ave., Vice President AFSCME Local 2620
Ida V. Strickland, 1664 Fulton St., Administrator
Calvin Welch, 519 Ashbury St., Community Consultant

JOHN L. MOLINARI

My address is 30 16th Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: To make San Francisco work takes both good ideas and cooperation with everyone.

For over 12 years as your Supervisor, my contribution has been to bring together both the diverse viewpoints of San Francisco’s many communities and the other Supervisors to solve our city’s problems. With your support, I’ve:
—Promoted the construction of more housing; limited condominium conversions to protect renters; protected tenants from rent gougers and outrageous security deposits;
—Initiated escort services to protect seniors;
—Initiated preferential parking and parking ticket amnesty programs;
—Protected our neighborhood character from big companies forcing out small merchants; and
—Protected San Francisco’s parks and playgrounds.

The sponsors for John L. Molinari are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
George Christopher, 1700 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Sara Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
John Francis Foran, 900 Rockdale Dr., State Senator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Louise K. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Homemaker/Media Producer
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Member, Public Utilities Commission
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, I.W.W.
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director, Patient Advocacy
Gordon J. Lau, 540 19th Ave., Member, Port Commission
Yori Wada, 564 4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Duke J. Armstrong, 352 Divisadero St., Former President, C.R.N.
Paul Boneberg, 647-A Castro St., President, Stonewall Gay Political Club
Diana Christiansen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, Community United Against Violence
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter (B.A.R.)
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Member, Harvard Milk Lesbian & Gay Political Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington Way, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Political Club
Maureen J. Conroy, 650 Eucalyptus Dr., Homemaker
John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Chair, Sierra Club Bay Chapter
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus
Michael S. Salarino, 95 Crestlake Dr., Sunset District Merchant

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

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Senior Health Care Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I am a political progressive with extensive professional experience as an administrator, program consultant, mediator, and service provider. These skills and my perspective will be valuable additions to the Board.

My commitment to economic and social justice is backed by 25 years of community service to ethnic and cultural minorities, women, low- and moderate-income families, elders, youths, gay people, small businesses, workers, the disabled, and government policy-makers.

I support neighborhood preservation, affordable housing measures (including rent control), jobs and job training for San Franciscans, comparable worth, and environmental safeguards.

I am a parent and San Francisco homeowner.  

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Priscilla Alexander, 745 Hught St., Feminist Activist
Zohn F. Artman, 141 Albion St., Media Consultant
Michael Bernick, 378 Golden Gate Ave., Executive Director, SF Renaissance
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing Manager
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, CUAV
Dennis M. Collins, 145-27th St., Political Consultant
Greg Day, 2226 Market St., Youth Services Director
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Attorney/Teacher
Walter R. Ens, 184 Eureka St., Retired
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 765 Geneva Ave., Confidential Secretary
Roma Guy, 583 Missouri St., Co-Director, The Women's Foundation
Kenneth W. Jones, 600 Fillmore St., Office Manager, SF AIDS Foundation
Linda Jupiter, 2785-22nd St., Book Production Manager
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Senior Services Administration
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Sandy Ouye Mori, 300 Presidio Ave., Administrator
Jane McKeeles Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant, S.F. Sheriff's Department
Juanita Owens, 371 Cole Ridge St., Educator/Administrator
Tish A. Pearlman, 464 Duboce Ave., Writer/Photographer
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Political Activist
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Union Business Representative
Marguerite Rubenstein, 46 Stillings Ave., Therapist
Stephen H. Walters, 1223 Diamond St., Fundraiser

JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS

My address is 1203 Clayton Street
My occupation is Executor (Probate Attorney)
My qualifications for office are: This is not New York. My grandfather worked for this city for thirty-six years; helping to make San Francisco the greatest place on earth in which to live. Now our city bus system has to go hat in hand to Los Angeles to borrow buses. The quality of care at our general hospital has come under extreme question. The city of love, tolerance, and understanding is becoming more and more divided by every hate on earth. I, as a fourth generation San Franciscan, call upon you to join with us natives in the fight to keep San Francisco San Francisco.

Joseph James Phillips

The Sponsors for Joseph J. Phillips are:

Margaret Moskovitz Berzin, 2201 Lake St., Retired
Ernest Lotti, 797 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
Amelia Sheehan, 436-27th Ave., Homemaker
Salvador Garza, 795 Brunswick St., Businessman
Gerald E. Gallagher, 2282-34th Ave., Retired
Jean M. McDermott, 225-9th Ave., Tax Preparer
A. John Shinn, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Juanita G Cardellini, 1215-16th St., Retired
Peter G. Economon, 2040 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Laurn Lotti, 797 Avalon Ave., Volunteer for Handicapped
Lee S. Delson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Consuelo G. MacDonald, 801-44th Ave., Retired
Roger Boschetti, 20 Carmelita St., Television Producer
Jody S. Hirota, 571-19th Ave., Dental Hygienist
Maureen C. Bihan, 111 Willard North St., Salesman
Kelly Lyon, 435-25th Ave., Secretary
Ralph A. Barsi, 1236 Athens St., Retired Teamster
Laura B. Campbell, 1275-32nd Ave., NOW
William E. Beyer, Jr., 3232 Geary Blvd., Printer
Paree Wong, 1555 Shredar St., Housewife
Sophia E. Conley, 2845 Cabrillo St., Teacher
Jimmy Starr, 23 Boardman Pl., Lawyer
Hannah Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
John L. Santiago, 150 Woodland Ave., Retired
Walter J. Murphy, 767 Corbett Ave., Retired
Carl H. Hoppe, 100 Hamilton St., Retired
Jack L Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
Sam Keksteine, 84 Lopez Ave., Self Employed
Helen Marie Sheehan, 875-38th Ave., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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LOUISE RENNE

My address is 3725 Jackson Street
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
My age is 47

My qualifications for office are: As Finance Committee chairperson I have protected vital services while cutting wasteful expenditures. Sound policies have been implemented. San Francisco is on solid financial footing.

At the same time I played a leadership role in legislation affecting the environment, health care, Muni, the arts, indeed all San Franciscans (including our seniors and children).

My prior experience includes Deputy Attorney General, Criminal and Environmental Units; argued cases in Supreme Court; President, California Women Lawyers.

As an effective Supervisor, I pledge to continue my hard work, to act responsibly and compassionately, and to speak honestly on the critical issues affecting all San Franciscans.

Louise Renne

The sponsors for Louise Renne are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman 16th District
Bernard Averbuck, 59 Rivoli St., Public Relations
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director—CYO—Urban Development
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Pres. Airport Commission
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Harry G. Britt, 783A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Sara Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Thomas J. Cahill, 246-17th Ave., Chief of Police, Retired
Lily Cuneo, 3519 Jackson St., Housewife
Dianne Feinstein, 2050 Lyon St., Mayor
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President, Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Vice President, ILGWU
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman/Commissioner
John S. Jennings, 2743 San Bruno Ave., Realtor (Ret.)
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director of ILGWU
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
Leslie M. Lawrence, 2423 Broadway, Certified Public Accountant
Louis Hop Lee, 786-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner and Attorney
Melvin D. Lee, 450-22nd Ave., Engineer (Commissioner, S.F. Redevelopment Agency)
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Cyril Magnin, One Nob Hill Cir., Philanthropist
Lee McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor, State of California
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Business Representative
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Viecete St., Investment Advisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davie Ct., Member, SF Board of Supervisors
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CAROL RUTH SILVER

My address is 68 Ramona Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: Experience: Seven years a San Francisco Supervisor; twenty years a practicing attorney; mother of two.

—Responsiveness to neighborhoods:
—My parking reform legislation will open up neighborhood parking spaces.
—My fire and smoke detector legislation will make our whole City more safe.

—Advocate for fairness legislation:
—preserving sunlight in parks
—outlawing gay discrimination
—creating low and moderate income housing
—repairing City streets and buildings
—rent control
—protecting Chinatown merchants
—S.A.F.E. and Senior Escort Programs
—Neighborhood Arts Programs
—reducing smog
—preserving San Francisco Bay
—expanding Muni
—wheelchair accessibility
—more women and minorities receiving City contracts
—child care

I will continue to insist on fairness. Carol Ruth Silver

The Sponsors for Carol Ruth Silver are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist
Sara Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
George Agnos, 2131 Funston Ave., City Attorney
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., San Francisco Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., San Francisco Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, 353 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., San Francisco Supervisor
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, President, Airport Commission
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Utilities Commissioner
Emmet D. Condon, 2506-21st Ave.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Julie C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Tim M. Davenot, 645 Randolph St., Charity Media Specialist
Teressa E. Griffin, 839-41st Ave., Retired Teacher
Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired
Samuel Jordan, 4006-3rd St., Caterer
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Civil Engineer
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Education
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Blvd., Realtor
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Business Representative
Jack Trujillo, 74 Ramona St., Word Processor

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

DAVID C. SMITH

My address is 2567 Alemany Blvd.
My occupation is Administrator, Service Agency
My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: I am a San Francisco State graduate in journalism, married, with a deep affection for this place. For seven years my wife and I have counseled families and individuals from every neighborhood in San Francisco—an investment and commitment to the future. Dealing with these problems has increased my awareness of this city’s growing preoccupation with rights and shrinking concern for responsibilities. The solution includes a return to basics, to strong family units, to solid values, to the worth of all human life. I will be a voice for those who feel excluded, especially exploited children and the disadvantaged.

David C. Smith

The sponsors for David C. Smith are:

James Bailey, St., 322 Guerrero St., Minister
Lillian P. Bailey, 422 Guerrero St., Housewife
Janis Ann Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Secretary
Jeffrey Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Secretary
Robert R. Carlson, 337 Baden St., Radio Producer
Victoria A. Carlyle, 1808 Octavia St., Political Analyst
John William Castro, 3 Plymouth St., Mover
John Frederick Decker, 1060 Eddie St., Designer
Frances Edwards, 2544 Alemany Blvd., Housewife
Daisy Hepburn, 20 Topia Dr., Homemaker
David Hepburn, 20 Topia Dr., High School President
James W. Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Police Officer
Jean Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Housewife
James L. Higgins, 270 Juanita Way, Pastor
Margaret M. Lee, 730-12th Ave., Secretary
Mark W. Lee, 581 Silver Ave., President, Simpson College
Arvid Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Norma Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Secretary
Philip Litton, 3340 San Bruno Ave., Student
John A. McGeehan, 1230 LaPlaya St., Military, U.S. Army
Charles A. McInerney, 1350 Lawson St., Clergy
J. Thad McKinney, 760 Kansas St., Station Manager
Marlyn G. Miller, 518 Dewey Blvd., Secretary
Chris Montgomery, 518 Dewey Blvd., Church Worker
Lawrence W. Pang, 254 Arch St., Environmental Health Inspector
James Douglas Robinson, 1319-7th Ave., Moving Company
Manager

KEVIN STARR

My address is 445 Chestnut Street
My occupation is Businessman, Communicator, Professor
My age is 44

My qualifications for office are: Born in San Francisco, I relish the past, present and future of this great city. I know it from a variety of perspectives—as executive aide to Mayor Alioto, as City librarian, as a newspaper columnist, as a professor, as a businessman, and as a person active in many civic causes. I now wish to bring my talents and experience to the Board of Supervisors. I believe I can be of unique service as the centrist advocate of this city as it looks to its future. That future, the well-being of each of us, will be my greatest concern.

Kevin Starr

The sponsors for Kevin Starr are:

Richard B. Allen, 2111 Franklin St., Merchant
Lynn A. Altshuler, 1490 Sacramento St., Attorney
Thomas E. Anderson, 236 Moneida Way, Clergyman
Michael Berinick, 780 Goldengate Ave., Job Training Director
Gino Bitadelli, 708 Columbus Ave., Restaurateur
Sam Camhi, 263 San Anselmo Ave., Insurance Estate Planner
Frank J. Caufield, 1034 Chestnut St., Venture Capital Investor
Victor L. Chu, 1282 Vallejo St., Asian Art Commissioner
Elizabeth A. Cooley, 2820 Scott St., Legal Assistant
Paul Denning, 2165 California St., Investment Banker
Martin Eng, 683 Pine St., County Central Committee Member
James W. Haas, 163 Prospect Ave., Attorney
Patrick E. Hallinan, 117-27th Ave., Attorney
Walter E. Houldley, 909 Green St., Economist
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Allan S. Johnson, 165 Prospect Ave., Consultant
Donn John Jones, 245 Northpoint St., Geonomist; Director, Meals on Wheels
Harold K. Lipsett, 2509 Pacific Ave., Private Investigator
Frances A. Lopez, 1474 Sacramento St., Paralegal
Paul E. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Editor
John Maher, 795-8th Ave., Executive
Roxanne Mankin, 232 Pacific Ave., Investment Real Estate
Michael Marston, 3535 Jackson St., Real Estate and Development Consultant
Larry Mazola, 3060-24th Ave., Assl. Business Manager, Local # 38
John N. Rosekrans, Jr., 2840 Broadway, Businessman, Toy Manufacturer
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crellin Dr., Neighborhood Businessman
Michael Strumsky, 226 Bay St., Construction Executive
Brooks Walker, Jr., 2980 Broadway, Business Executive
Suzan Yee, 632-6th Ave., Attorney

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

JOHN E. WAHL

My address is 118C Connecticut Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: I have a 20 year record of voluntary, unpaid public service to San Francisco. I have worked with all levels of City government, with people in all parts of the City. Examples of my public service include being a Judge Pro Temp of the San Francisco Municipal Court, 9 years of service on the Board of the San Francisco Council of Churches, service on the Pride Foundation Board, and service to veterans.

I am dedicated to ensuring affordable places to live, a responsible and judicious police department, decent jobs, and dependable transportation.

I am independent of special interest club politics.

John E. Wahl

The sponsors for John F. Wahl are:

Sondra D. Marwell, 1500 Jerrard Ave., Executive Director
John Borden, 1435 Willard St., Vice President, Community College Board
Caroline W. Marks, 55 Jordan Ave., Economist and Civic Leader
James E. Sandahm, 450 Buchanan St., Minster
E. Patricia (Pas) Lacy, 601 Huntington Dr., Attorney
Benjamin L. Marcus, 86 Winfield St., Rabbi and Chaplain
Bob Ross, 4200-36th St., Newspaper Publisher
Walter W. Grumet, 1126-2nd St., Clergyman
Ann Marie Day, 136 Delmar St., Retired Social Worker
Cleve Jonton, 38-38th St., Legislator at Large
Paul S. Yeat, 342-4th Ave., Rail Estates Agent
Hank Wilson, 1521 Market St., Hotel Operator
Fred L. Kurthander, 115 San Alien, Attorney
Saul Wall Burgess, 4214-2nd Ave., Lawyer
Gary A. Moerman, 136 Sprague, Ed., Education Administrator
Paula F. Lichtenberg, 925 Jones St., Paralegal
Paul D. Fuhrman, 116 Pacific Ave., Author, Retired Publisher
Jerry G. Guernier, 35 Fortuna St., Retailer
Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr., M.D. 2170 Hayes St., Physician
Foster W. Weeks, 1910 Greenough St., Advertising Consultant
Shirley Kaiser, 2016-21st Ave., Teacher
Robert W. Shote, 140 Guerrero St., Businessman
Ron M. Kwong, 312 Van Ness Ave., Law Student
Chiulene Yamano, 410 Fourth Blvd., Secretary
Jeanetta Sibley, 75 Woodhaven Ct., Classroom Teacher
Alan Thompson Smith, 198 Palo Alto Ave., Small Business Owner
William Earl Andrews, 4130 Arroyo St., Taxi Driver
Larry E. Hughes, 388 Fortuna St., Paralegal Consultant
Juliet V. DeChavez, 1591-49th Ave., Deputy County Clerk

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is Staff-writer for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 58

My qualifications for office are: My program:

Courts, cops and strikebreaking injunctions; two-gate, two-tiered, union-busting tactics, are helping employers depress living standards. Escalating health, housing and food costs are forcing working people—especially Blacks and Latinos—out of San Francisco. Corporate condos and highrisers replace workers' residences.

Door-to-door canvassers, denied childcare, are left to roam the streets. Abortion clinics are under siege.

Only united labor—employed, unemployed, black, white—can change this condition. An independent labor party, based on the unions, must be built to replace the callous politicians of the two ruling capitalist parties.

Jobs not war!

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Alan A. Benjamin, 2923-20th St., Editor, Socialist Action
Paul Cabria, 554-36th Ave., Printer
Nancy D. Finer, 615 Central Ave., Teacher
Ralph P. Freytag, 762 Crost St., Teacher
Mary May Cong, 25 Bessie St., Power Plant Operator
Nancy L. Crain, 921 Alvardo St., Editor
Marily. E. Gonsalves, 2531-53rd Ave., Student
Asher F. Hazen, 140 Ocean St., Retired Longshoreman
Ruth Hazen, 140 Detroit St., Retired Office Worker
Dorothy G. Harrison, 1201-19th St., Retail Clerk
William C. Leamer, 535 Taft St., Mechanic
Arco Menache, 2149-40th Ave., Planner
Linda A. Ray, 3740-25th St., Registered Nurse
Anne A. Robertson, 535 Taft St., Professor
Joseph M. Stahl, 25 Bessie St., Machinist
Kenton A. Schnee, 3515-16th St., Sales Clerk
Michael William Schreiber, 3300 Mission St., Mini Driver
Carole Selman, 245 Whitney St., Mini Bus Driver
Kathryn Schenck, 1364-16th Ave., Engineer
Margery Joan VanDeHecke, 1540-21st St., Registered Nurse
Christine Vaughn, 1251 Polk St., Poster or Clerk
Dorothy West, 2343-39th Ave., Power Plant Operator
Bonnie Weinstein, 1716 Ranato Ave., Student
Deborah Weinstein, 1293 Church St., Unemployed Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 899-27th St., Painter

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

-DAVE WHARTON-

My address is 5031 Diamond Heights Blvd.
My occupation is Community Service Attorney
My age is 44


It's time for housing expansion, for transit, traffic, parking overhaul. Time for better City services, especially for seniors and youth. Time to strengthen economy, create jobs, control taxes. Time for neighborhood revitalization, parking relief. Time for human rights advancement, efficient and humane police services. Experiment with Board meetings in neighborhoods.

It's time for goals, results, citizen participation. San Francisco is world class city, small town; lose either, be neither. I build bridges, not barriers. Join our common sense coalition.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:

Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Libby Denebem, 200 St Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Attorney/Rent Board Commissioner
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Russell Flynn, 2815 Pacific Ave., Real Estate/Rent Board Commissioner
Charles B. Renfrew, 791-14th Ave., Attorney/Former Federal Judge
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Hotel/Real Estate Executive
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Alcida Wang, 1418 Leavenworth St., Educational Specialist
Mortimer Fleishacker, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Investor
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
Diane C. Kefauver, 1726 Great Highway, Consultant
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Union President/Retired
Jose Gomez, 59 Grandview Ave., Legal Services/Executive Director
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
John L. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Insurance/Savings and Loan Chairman
Phyllis Kern, 306 Arbor St., Labor Union Secretary
Russell L. Kassman, 2454 Bush St., Businessman
Laura E. McBride, 925 Cole St., Typographer
George M. Raya, 90 Verna Ct., City Employee
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Development Executive
Gloria Armiijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Agent
Lawrence A. Wilson, 333-A Pierce St., Attorney—Community Volunteer
Deborah R. Pines, 4248-20th St., Financial Consultant
John T. McAlister, Jr, 999 Green St., Businessman
Bobbie Griffith, 50 Leland Ave., District Attorney Investigator
Edith Wellin, 165-A Alpine Ter., Teacher

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

DICK CERBATOS

My address is 471 Hoffman Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have always been deeply interested in the education of youth. Before my appointment to the Board of Education two years ago, I served twenty years on Citizens' Advisory and PTA committees focusing on education. As an engineer business-owner, I also bring professional skills to the Board.

As a first generation American, I am sympathetic to minority children's problems, and aware that public education is the golden gateway to opportunity and success.

I intend to continue pressing for higher test scores, improved discipline and morale, less truancy, and an increase in college admissions.

I am committed to excellence in education.

A. Richard Cerbatos

The sponsors for Dick Cerbatos are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Lawyer
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borcie, 234 Gates St., Attorney at Law
Harry G. Britz, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director
Judy Della Monica, 3323 Taraval St., President, San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
Jess T. Esteve, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President-Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Eugene S. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Physician
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Ralph F. Hurtado, 65 Newburg St., Executive Director
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Labor Vice President, ILGWU

Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir. ILWU
Mrya G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Bette Wallace Landis, 44 Estrada Ct., Volunteer
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moncone, 45 St. Francis Cir., Homemaker
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Ben Tim, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Yuri Wieda, 56S-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, S.F. Board of Supervisors

A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilarius St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON

My address is 29 Oliver Street
My occupation is Transit Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I was born and raised in San Francisco, graduating from Balboa High.

For the past 7 years I have been active in the school district having been elected to 2 terms on the District Advisory Committee, 4 years as the chairperson of the Petron Academic Middle School Parent's Group, and 5 years on the site advisory council at Petron.

I am married and have 2 children attending Commodore Sloat Elementary School.

I believe there is much work needed to provide the quality education our children need to prepare them for a highly technical society of computers and robotics.

Chris Christenson

The sponsors for Christopher Christenson are:

Essie L. Webb, 186 Maddux Ave., Intake & Referral Specialist
Raymond Tinsdale, 515 John Muir Dr., Deputy Sheriff
Francis Smyth, 1700-16th Ave., Deputy Sheriff
Harry E. Jensen, III, 74 Delmonte St., Electrical Transit Manager
Joe W. Turner, 1274 Palou Ave., Janitor Supervisor II
Martin Larkin, 4733 Lincoln Way, Paint Supervisor
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Supervisor II
Joseph Dela Rosa, 50 Oliver St., Seaman
Precious Moore, 2048 Thomas Ave., Home Health Aide
Liana Sand Dune Kastina, 524 Clipper St., Clerk Typist
William Satchell, 500 Francisco St., Transit Car Cleaner
Roy W. Haver, 576 Lisbon St., Marble Shopman
Gualdalupe Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Jeanne L. Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Grocery Clerk
Roosevelt Lancaster, 170 Ledyard St., Transit Car Cleaner
Lena M. Quintana, 3331 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Alfred Lent, 1475 Church St., Electrical Mechanic
George Williams, Sr., 335 Hearst Ave., Retired
Beatrice L. Dunbar, 430 Thornton Ave., Retired
Vicente Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Driver
Gabriela, R. Wilkerson, 1347-15th Ave., Cashier

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
LIBBY DENEBEIM

My address is 200 St. Francis Blvd.
My occupation is Incumbent School Board Member
My qualifications for office are: Four years ago you elected me to the school board. I am deeply grateful.

I have worked hard. Student achievement scores improved, enrollment stabilized. We strengthened significantly special programs and alternative schools.

There remains much work to do. As a mother of six public school educated children, former teacher and experienced school board member, I know how our schools should work.

Many children today will finish school in the 21st Century. For all our children we must plan for the future, reaffirm our commitment to excellence. Use school dollars prudently and ensure the momentum for improvement in our schools continues.

Libby Denebeim

GEORGE DYKSTRA

My address is 949 Filbert Street
My occupation is Community Services Director
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am trained in government finance and Citizen Participation decision making. Long community involvement includes director, Educational Services, Executive Board of Golden Gate Child Development, Saint Mary's Hospital Board and Yick Wo Elementary Parent's Committee. My education includes a B.A., emphasizing Education and U.S.C. graduate school.

I am practical, experienced and positive. I expect more from students, parents and teachers. I promise fiscal responsibility. I respect and support parent participation, teacher professionalism and every student's right to learn in well-equipped, orderly schools. Opportunity, Technology and Basics.

Vote for me! I will keep children in the picture.

George Dykstra

The sponsors for Libby Denebeim are:
Robert S. Denebeim, 200 St Francis Blvd., Businessman
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Sara Burton, 8 Sloet Blvd., Congresswoman
William K. Coblenz, 13-5th Ave., Attorney
Patricia F. Costello, 2838 Green St., Community Leader
Carlota T. del Portillo, 54 Berkeley Way, Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Zuretti L. Groosby, 259 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA Volunteer
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Cynthia Brown Kelly, 460 Magellan St., Homemaker
Myra G. Kopf, 1946-12th Ave., Board of Education Member
Ruth Asawa Lamier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan St., Lt. Governor
Peter Mesez, 3352 Clay St., Attorney/Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., Mental Health Director
John L. Mollinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder, 150 Cuiutita Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
Philip Bruce Rafal, 962 Clayton St., SF Open Space Committee Member
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor/Gay Ledaer
Joan-Marie Shelley, 395 Burnett Ave., Teacher/President, SF Federation of Teachers
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Pamela Pantel Waller, 649 San Jose Ave., Contract Compliance Representative
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Malcolm S.M. Watts, 270 Seaciff Ave., Physician

The sponsors for George Dykstra are:
Lisa Bardaro, M.D., 880 Sloat Blvd., Physician
Millicent E. Buxton, 30 Parnassus Ave., Educator
Robert T. Corrado, 18 Miramar Ave., Administrator
Teresa M. D'Auray, 78 Heathcr St., Environmental Fund Raising
Kathleen DePaula, 949 Filbert St., Psychologist
Kathleen Dykstra, 949 Filbert St., Legal Administrator
Linda J. Guadreau, 858-26th Ave., Director of Medical Records
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Attorney-at-Law
Ann K. Howell-Hosom, 904 Cordland Ave., Volunteer Coordinator
D. S. Imba, 44 Escondido Ave., Acupuncturist
Martha Anne Jessup, 2502 Diamond St., Educator
Deborah L. Keller, 1466-41 Ave., Student
Katherine Lambert, 63 Winfield St., Women's Services Consultant
Mim Landry, 1060 Cole St., Student
Nick Lederer, 79 Mizpah St., Executive Director, Senior Services
Dr. Thomas S. McCoy, 1446 Chay St., Professor
Tim P. Moss, M.D. S.S Lundby's Ln., AIDS Clinician-Researcher
Susan L. Mok, 1332-38th Ave., Acupuncturist
Marcia Quackenbush, 1690-27th Ave., Social Worker
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director
CAHEED
Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Director of Health
Kenneth M. Sims, 1454 Palou Ave., Associate Director Child Development Center
David E. Smith, 80 Parnassus Ave., Physician
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Monte Carlo St., Attorney
Michael Stepanian, 2109 Baker St., Attorney
Harvey W. Q. Tse, 70 Lomita Ave., Businessman
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilitias, Methodist Minister
E. Leif Zerkin, 1250-26th Ave., Editor

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

My address is 665 Pine Street
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant
My qualifications for office are: Twelve years of community and civic service.

Issues
Eng supports:
  • Our children’s inherent right for education.
  • Regain respect for our teachers.
  • Strict measures to halt school violence. Stop the sale and use of street drugs.
  • Higher standards for teachers and students.
  • Encourage teachers and parents participation within the Board.
  • Merit pay to outstanding teachers.
Maximize income: Lease surplus school properties. End mismanagement by incompetent Board members.
Eng opposes:
  • Current programs teaching alternative lifestyle to our precious children. A violation of the First Amendment.
  • Board members extravagant dinner meetings with liquor paid for by taxpayers. A blatant violation of the law.

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:
John Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Real Estate Broker, Former Supervisor
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Commissioner, Contractors State License Board, State of California
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor, Former Supervisor
Dr. John B. Tsu, 2 Denslow Dr., Education Commissioner
Melvin M. Bell, 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Landmark Preservation Board
Steven J. Doy, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
C. Mackey E. Salazar, 183 San Benito Way, City Planning Commissioner
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli St., Retired
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, State Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Anna Kyle Pauweng, 30 Cunningham Pl., Legal Assistant
Tony Kifroy, 473-11th Ave., Vice President, District One Political Action
Kevin G. Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Property Consultant
John S. Tang, M.D., 2184 Funston Ave., Physician
Timothy A. Truta, 870 Ashbury St., Attorney
Jung Roy Gee, 665 Pine St., Investor, Education Researcher
William Bernstein, 1000 Franklin St., Attorney
Robert P. Varni, 10 Miller Pl., Chairman-Police Data Systems
Frank S. Yee, 358 Los Palamos Dr., Real Estate Finance; Teacher
Rev. Charles A. Melchenny, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
William Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney at Law
F. Theodore Kirt, 2801 Broadway, Lawyer
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis Ter., V.P., Branch Manager. S & L
Volma Petersilie, 665 Pine St., Teacher
Ed Pond, 16-38th Ave., Insurance broker/Accountant
S.M. Saroyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Business Enterprises/Lawyer
Frank M. Aloito, 2898 Vallejo St., Restaurant Owner
W.F. O’Keefe, Sr., 444 Crest Ave., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Assn.

EUGENE S. HOPP, M.D.

My address is 601 Van Ness Avenue, Opera Plaza
My occupation is Physician
My qualifications for office are: For the past thirty years I have served on the Board of Education providing an independent voice committed to the goal of educating all our children to their fullest potential. The current emphasis on teaching the basics must continue, combined with offerings of high technology and vocational education designed to prepare our diverse student population for a changing future. I stand for an integrated educational program and welcome parents and the public to talk to me in this challenge.

The sponsors for Dr. Eugene S. Hopp are:
Molly M. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Police Commissioner
Dianne Feinstein, 3020 Lyon St., Mayor
Joseph L. Aloito, 2510 Pacific Ave., Attorney
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Agrinio R. Cerbato, 471 Hoffman Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, Vice President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr. 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission
Burl A. Toller, 581 Orizaba Ave., Police Commissioner
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Castas Ave., Police Commissioner
Alan S. Wong 1280 Ellis St., Commissioner, Community College
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member S.F. Community College
John F. Crowley, 67 Los Palamos Dr., Labor Official
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Amos J. Castro, 1401 California St., Physician
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Civil Rights Commissioner
Harry Polland, 637 Powell St., Economist
Saul Madfes, 75 Country Club Dr., Retired, School Administrator
Jo Bobbaun, 1750 Taylor St., Housewife
Anita H. Sanchez, 44 Restani Way, Social Worker
Chadwick C. Ertola, 660 Greenwich St., Attorney
Naomi Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Businesswoman
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
Raye G. Richardson, 1714 Fillmore St., Assoc. Professor
Max L. Christensen, 2 Heather Ave., Clergyman
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave., Assis Business Mgr.
Leo J. Murphy, Sr., 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Loren E. De Lara, 2 Lenox Way, Educational Consultant
Gregory C. Linner, 2600 Webster St., Realtor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
TERRY HUGUNIN
My address is 1824 Noriega Street
My occupation is Consultant
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: Those of us who were teenagers during President Kennedy’s Appolo Space Program thought there was nothing we and our nation might not accomplish: “We’re going to the moon in ten years!” Thanks to outfits like the National Education Association, the science oriented New Frontiers of the 60’s have given way to the “other-directedness” of the Aquarian Age. Their goal: form a society of androgy nous pacifists—study their literature. Mine is to restore the problem-solving orientation appropriate to Judeo-Christian culture. Help me mobilize our schools to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative and overcome the nuclear war threat.

Terry Hugunin

JAMES LEGARE
My address is 254 Oak Street
My occupation is Motor Truck Operator
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I am committed to installing a sound educational program in our schools as the basis for getting our country and economy moving again—in the American tradition. We need to develop young minds through a program of classical education and to protect them by wiping out drugs in the schools and in the nation.

I propose to reform the school system along these lines:
1) Classical geometry and physics, as typified by Plato, Archimedes, Cusa Kepler, and Leibniz
2) Classical poetry, music, and drama, exemplified by Homer, Aeschylus, Dante, Shakespeare, Schiller, Bach, and Beethoven

James Legare

The sponsors for Terry Hugunin are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coisman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Parallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Casparano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

The sponsors for James Legare are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coisman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Parallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Casparano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Nick Pace, 130 Campbell Ave., Railroad Employee
Sandra Parks, 16 Garces St., Railroad Employee
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
Nicholas E. Vallejo, 875 Cayuga Ave., Electrician
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

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

JO ANNE MILLER
My address is 1920 Quint Street
My occupation is Parent and Teacher
My qualifications for office are: I am the mother of two children in San Francisco Public Schools. I believe in the Public School System, and have a personal interest in its quality and effectiveness. I am a teacher of the blind. I am President of the Glen Park School Site Advisory Committee, and hold other elected civic offices.

The lack of parent representation on the School Board has contributed to a lack of parent and citizen involvement, a lack of long-term planning and vision in school administration, and a failure to commit the School District to a plan and goal of excellence for all children.

JoAnne Miller

BEN TOM
My address is 1717 Jones Street
My occupation is Transportation Analyst
My qualifications for office are: I believe I have provided outstanding leadership during my eight years on the San Francisco Board of Education. This is evidenced by the fact that test scores have improved and new programs have attracted students back from private schools.

As an active parent, I know San Francisco's schools first-hand. I have worked conscientiously for our children's future. I have the vision and I have gained the practical skills necessary to continue building our school district into one of the best large urban districts in the nation.

Benjamin Tom

The sponsors for JoAnne Miller are:
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Angel D. Contreras, 1461 Alabama St., Administrator of Headstart
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Dening St., President, San Francisco NOW
Linda Fries, 830-35th Ave., Community Organizer
Bob Geary, 2578 Great Highway, San Francisco Police Officer
Louise Harvey, 673 Fulton St., Educational Consultant
Marilee Hearn, 3030 Turk Blvd., Teacher
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Ron Huberman, 81 Wilier St., District Attorney Investigator
Daro Inouye, 251 Gates St., Attorney
Cleve Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Assistant
Leroy King, 75 Sampa Ln., Reg. Dir., ILWU
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Jean E. Kortum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member of Board of Supervisors
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Business Executive
Hugh B. Miller, 355 Roosevelt Way, Attorney
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
James E. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Taxi Cab Owner
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 938 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director, CAHEED, Inc.
Jerry Ringerman, 485 Crestmont Dr., Executive Director, San Francisco Jewish Community Center
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SF
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Member, AAFUM

The sponsors for Ben Tom are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Wendy Nelder, 150 Castus Ave., Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Supervisor, San Francisco
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commission
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director, CYO
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Ben L. Hoff, 1 Villa Ter., Banker, Executive
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker, Community College Board Member
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director, Pre-Trial Diversion Project
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor, City and County
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Myra G. Kropf, 1940-12th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darion Way, School Board Member
Amos C. Brown, 111 Nuendo way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolff, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Board Member School Administrator
Ario Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Business Representative
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman, 16th District

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Candidates for College Board

**ERNEST “CHUCK” AYALA**

My address is 4402-20th Street  
My occupation is Youth Director, CYO-Urban Development Division  

My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan, South of Market neighborhood. Attended public and parochial schools, including City and Lone Mountain Colleges. My involvement in community development and public service is with youth in Education, Employment and Delinquency Prevention, in addition to developing and administering Senior Citizens and Veterans Programs. Business management background in labor, insurance and real estate provides me with a balanced approach to fiscal and administrative objectives of the Community College District. My continued goal for the Community College District is to retain its open door policy and remain responsive to the educational and vocational needs of the people.

*Ernest Chuck Ayala*

The sponsors for Ernest “Chuck” Ayala are:  
Reginald Y. Alexander, 182 Middlefield Dr., Vice Chancellor, Certificated  
Bernice E. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Homemaker  
Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College District  
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, S.F. Community College Board  
Vincent J. Callan, 4038 19th St., Retired  
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler  
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot St., Housewife  
Marjorie M. Colvin, 1835 Franklin St. #1403, Housewife  
Peter J. Fatoo, 30 Grand View Ave., Businessman  
William L. Fazio, 110 Inverness Dr., Asst District Attorney  
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley St., Management Consultant  
Al Graf, 859 Bryant St., Businessman  
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecreek Dr., Contractor  
Marcel Kapulica, 2470 22nd Ave., Dental Laboratory-Owner  
Louis L. Lagger, 4001 21st St., District Manager, Packing Co.  
Dorothy J. Lubetich, 15 Florentine St., Retired  
Ernestine A. McGoldrick, 4442 20th St., School Clerk/Housewife  
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., 1789 Eucalyptus St., State Assemblyman-Retired  
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors  
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board  
Sue Ann Rousseau, 340-A Taraval St., Florist  
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., President, S.F. Police Commission  
Bob (Robert) Schmidt, 4048 21st St., Librarian  
Thomastia N. Scott, 1912½ Broderick St., Youth Program Coordinator  
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba St., Educator/Police Commissioner  
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education  
Yori Wada, 505 4th Ave., U.C. Regent  
Bernard J. Ward, 3200 Kirkham St., Atty at law  
Bill Zorzakis, 245 Castro St., Shoe Repairer

**AMOS CLEOPHILUS BROWN**

My address is 111 Lunado Way  
My occupation is Clergyman  
My age is 43  

My qualifications for office are: I hold the B.A., M.Div. and D.D. degrees. 16 years of public service on boards of education throughout the U.S. more than qualifies me for the position.

My services on the Board of Governors since 1982 reflect that I am competent and able to work with a team of governors to ensure the delivery of a quality education system for all persons in our community who desire training for marketable skills. Community College also must serve the needs of those who for various reasons have not had the opportunity of going to other institutions of higher learning for training.

*Amos C. Brown*

The sponsors for Amos C. Brown are:  
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Member, Community College Board  
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, Community College Board  
Priscilla A. Dennard, 210 Broad St., Secretary  
James Gordon Emerson, Jr., 175 Beaumont St., Clergyman  
Mayor Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor  
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant  
Dr. Howard S. Floyd, 555 Nortage St., Minister  
Selma R. Harrison, 1587 Hayes St., Bookkeeper  
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors  
Grandwell A. Jackson, 257 Kensington Way, Retired  
Clifton R. Jeffers, 1883 14th Ave., Attorney-at-Law  
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors  
Quentin L. Koppl, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor  
John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors  
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council  
Laurel St. Newkirk, 554 Brussels St., System Support Librarian  
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors  
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board  
Naomi Shines, 756 Page St., Fiscal Clerk  
Rabbi Malcolm M. Sparer, 1059 Clement St., Rabbi  
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., College Board Member  
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education  
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors  
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors  
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilliris St., Minister  
Hannibal A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergyman  
Tomothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, President, College Board  
Alan S. Wong, 1250 Ellis St., Social Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PATRICK C. FITZGERALD

My address is 128 Detroit Street
My occupation is San Francisco County Central Committeeman, 16th Assembly District.
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are:
- Am married, father of three children and a homeowner
- Graduated: St. Ignatius College Prep. and City College of San Francisco
- Elected San Francisco County Central Committeeman (since 1970)
- California State Central Committeeman (since 1978)
- Attended San Francisco 1984 National Presidential Convention for Mondale-Ferrero
- Served on San Francisco City Government CATV Task Force Educational Access Committee
- Instrumental in adoption of San Francisco City College Labor Studies Program
- Great Nephew of former San Francisco County Supervisor Tom O'Dowd
- Past Secretary San Francisco County Central Committeee
- Strong opponent 1983 Feinstein Recall
- Successfully fought peripheral canal
- Support Propositions: 33 (disabled homeowners) and 40 (political campaign reform).

Patrick C. Fitzgerald

The sponsors for Patrick C. Fitzgerald are:

Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney
Lee S. Dolson, 1759 Beach St., College Professor
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official
John J. Moylan, 2985-29th Ave., Labor Leader
Terence Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Marion L. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Social Worker
Patrick K. Mooser, 1762-17th Ave., Tax Consultant/Bookkeeper
Josephine Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman

Clara Stein, 2350 Slout Blvd., Cashier
Brian J. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Real Estate Broker
Sue T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., State Central Committeewoman

Mary Ann Cowen, 134 Detroit St., Secretary
Charles T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Retired
Emily H. Shimmon, 19 Middlfield St., Housewife
Thomas P. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Displayman
Esther F. Zott, 75 Middlefield St., Retired
Peter B. Paragas, 1923 San José Ave., Engineering Graduate
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee

Adriano Bliotti, 131 Detroit St., Retired
A. Lee Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, City College Graduate
Kenneth J. Lukas, 215 Detroit St., Carpenter
Lloyd A. Quain, 96 Staples St., Retired
Louise E. Quain, 96 Staples St., Retired
Mary W. Bray, 207 San Juan Ave., Gateman
Mary B. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Homemaker
Lisa L. Klobucar, 155 San Felipe Way, County Central Committeewoman

Susanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
Jim Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Arlie H. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney

DEAN GOODMAN

My address is 825 Geary Street #703
My occupation is Retired Teacher/Actor
My age is 64

My qualifications for office are: Thirty years of teaching, an educator's concern for quality instruction, and a citizen's awareness of the need for budget control. As the first fulltime president of the Community College Federation of Teachers, Local 2121 and as a former staff member of the District I know well the policies and procedures which form the structure of the Community College and the College Centers.

If elected, I will insist on fair hiring practices, and as a member of that most diverse of all groups, our Senior Citizens, I will support college services for all adults regardless of individual differences.

Dean Goodman

The sponsors for Dean Goodman are:

Priscilla Alden, 1677 Bush St., #5, Actress
Lugo Baldassari, 988 Dolores St., Theatre Director
James E. Ballard, 2 Arbor St., Teacher
Sheldon I. Balman, 5 Pervoe Ter., Attorney
Laurent R. Broussal, 855 Quintara St., Administrator, Community College
Kim Cichlan, 1330 Bush St., Bar Owner
Donald G. Climenti, 117 Ord St., Refugee Resettlement Counselor
Lauret Fried-Lee, 435 19th Ave., Community College Instructor
William Gundel, 1415 Franklin St., Credit Adjuseter
Frances T. Hughes, 2649 Polk St., Legal Secretary
Donna Ilyin, 76 6th Ave., Counselor
Lynda Bergren Kalb, 24 Magnolia St., Singer/Actress
Michael J. Mandel, 12 Marine St., Attorney
Donald J. Miller, 26 Leo St., Furniture Manufacturer
Roy Moran, 1607 Page St., Business Representative
Allen Nomura, 177 Bocana St., Theatreal Photographer
Judy Winn-Bell Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Teacher/Author(Editor
Roger E. W-B Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Publisher
Frank Reilly, 3415 Divisadero St., Advertising/Actor
James J. Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Rev. James E. Sandibre, 435 Buchanan St., Minister
Eve Stoddard, 180 Diamond St., Probate Administration
Daniel A. Sullivan, 1590 Sacramento St., Attorney
Doug Tranham, 701 Taylor St., Pianist
Sigrid Wurmschmidt, 1142 DeHaro St., Actress
Samuel L. Zanze, 2601 25th Ave., Businessman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ANDRE F. PEHARGOU

My address is 3840 Fulton Street
My occupation is Civil Servant

My qualifications for office are: I have been a resident of San Francisco for 34 years. I am a graduate of California State University San Francisco; San Francisco City College, and Lowell High School.

Most taxpayers are not benefitting from the Community College System due to lack of information and lack of convenient locations.

As a Board member, I will advocate a strong academic curriculum; More neighborhood locations to facilitate Senior citizens and working taxpayers; Better utilization of present facilities, and a decrease in tuition fees for City residents.

If you want expanded services to help benefit you, give me your support on election day.

Andre F. Pehargou

The sponsors for Adre F. Pehargou are:

William Angelopoulos, 39 Prague St., Employed
Renee Boulay, 605 Arguello Blvd., Retired
Josephine Buchiotti, 353 25th Ave., Retired
Andre Carrey, 487 2nd Ave., Retired
James Edward Coleman, 620 Banks St., Supervisor
Alice Crowe, 1827 Balboa St., Part Time Office Worker
Robert S. Flahavan, 151 Buchanan St., Operations Officer, S. F. Airport
Emma Garrigue, 2702 Anza St., Retired
Diana Hantman, 361 25th Ave., Teacher
Rose Hantman, 720 La Playa St., #307, Retired
Paulette Henderson, 798 Naples St., Retired
Paul Keplinger, 3832 Fulton St., Conclerge
Anna Kono, 3315 Irving St., Retired
James Courtney Kovach, 1282 43rd Ave., Lithographer
Eva Lim, 3832 Fulton St., Asst. Paymistress
D. Martin, 87 Seward St., Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788-18th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: Bachelor's degree in Psychology from the University of San Francisco; Master's in Education from Stanford University; Juris Doctorate from Hastings College of Law; a wife, mother, former teacher and counselor; and presently, Assistant District Attorney in San Francisco.

I have served diligently, always conscious of my responsibility to all the communities of San Francisco who gave me the highest number of votes four years ago. I strive to ensure that the Community College will continue providing quality education to all students, even during financial crises, without sacrificing student or faculty needs. As the only woman board member, I actively support women's issues.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
John Yehall Chinn, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guerrero St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member Board of Supervisors
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Univ of Calif Regent
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Commissioner, Board of Education/School Administrator
Arlo E. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Constance O'connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant SF Sheriff's Dept.
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfrod, 91 Sanchez St., President, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member SF Community College Board
Madeleine H. Russell, 3778 Washing St., Investments
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrer St., Planning Commissioner
Agrinio R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Director
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member SF Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Community Activist
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Carol Ruth Silver, 66 Ramona St., Incumbent SF Supervisor
Bette W. Landis, 46 Estrada Ct., Volunteer
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney's Investigator
Jeffrey K. Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 910 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer/Worker, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

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

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

Moy Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy Velasquez are:
Lilian Aldea, 231 Granada Ave., Teacher
Concepcion G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Teacher
Melandro Busto, 49 Capp St., Student
Victoriano G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Mechanic
Stasia Cagana, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Sales
Rosita T. Castaneda, 18 Guy Pl., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion P. Cespedes, 931 Prague St., Teacher
Cheryl R. Conrad, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student
Theresa N. Fabro, 416 Mission St., School Lunchroom Manager
Kenneth A. Guerra, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Technician
Odelia Jones, 1775 Newcomb Ave., Housekeeper
Felisa P. Misenas, 266 Brighton Ave., School Lunch Helper
Basil C. Nickerson, 336-6th St., Self Employed
Willie B. Nicholas, 1231-5th Ave., Custodian
Jack Lee Pownash, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Production Manager
Margaret M. Powers, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Customer Service
Clarice D. Robinson, 2445 Harrison St., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion A. Ramos, 2700 Folsom St., Room Cleaner
Murdie Washington, 195 Highland St., Monitor
David A. Woodard, 397 Green St., Chef

DR. TIM WOLFRED

My address is 91 Sanchez Street
My occupation is Incumbent, President, San Francisco Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: As an incumbent, I am proud of a College Board that, with less dollars than it had four years ago, has kept all programs operating and has expanded services to San Franciscans most dependent on a healthy community college system for access to job skills training and a basic college education. Neighborhood college centers have moved into larger, renovated facilities. Vocational offerings in fields like computer technologies, nursing, and auto mechanics have been updated. Classes in language skills have been strengthened in immigrant communities. We are a Board dedicated to quality education open to all San Franciscans.

Dr. Tim Wolfred

The sponsors for Dr. Tim Wolfred are:
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
Wille Brown, 1200 Gough St., Assembly Member
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembly Member
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff, City and County of San Francisco
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wille B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
G. W. Wong, 1265 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Julie Ting, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Member, Community College Board
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Sodonia Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., School Board Member
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member
Aguinaldo R. Ceballos, 471 Hoffman Ave, School Board Member
Carlota T. del Porrillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Harold Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillcrest St., Pastor, Glide Church
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher
Sandy Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Thomas Peretti, 587-16th St., Banker
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Sal Rosellini, 349 Lexington St., Union Official
Carole Migden, 563-28th St., Executive Director, Operation Concern

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Port Revenue Bonds

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?  

YES  253
NO  254

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Port Commission operates the Port of San Francisco. When funds are needed for Port construction or improvements, the Commission may issue revenue bonds to raise funds. A majority of the voters must approve these bonds before they can be issued. The revenue bonds are then paid from Port revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance several improvements of Port property. These improvements include modernizing container handling facilities, upgrading various piers, constructing a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, and renovating certain other Port structures and property. The bonds would then be paid off from Port revenues.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance improvements of Port property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Port Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

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

Bond redemption $ 42,500,000
Bond interest 81,761,400
Total debt service requirement $124,261,400

“Based on a three year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning four years after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $4,462,000 to a maximum of $5,760,000 annually for twenty-seven years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Port revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Port sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Port. Analysis of projected resources available to the Port indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On July 30 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on a motion placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 51.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The revitalization of the Port of San Francisco will bring new jobs and new tax revenue to the City. A healthy port, with increased ship traffic, will bring millions each year to the San Francisco economy.

By delaying modernizations in the past, the Port of San Francisco lost the bulk of its maritime business to other Bay Area and West Coast cities. The same mistakes must not be made twice. We must allow the Port to use revenues to finance continued improvements.

Proposition A does not authorize any new taxes. Proposition A simply authorizes the Port to use revenues to finance improvements and expansion.

Proposition A will allow for the modernization of existing container cargo terminals on the southern waterfront. These improved facilities will retain current business and will bring new lines to San Francisco. The return of the shipping business will bring back long lost blue collar jobs to the waterfront as well as white collar jobs.

In addition, Proposition A will provide for expansion of the passenger facility, a new breakwater to protect the commercial fishing fleet, and improved rail access to the port. In all, Proposition A will upgrade and modernize San Francisco Port facilities so as to make them competitive with other ports across the Bay and throughout the West Coast.

The complete modernization effort will be done at no cost to the taxpayers. Instead, the Port of San Francisco's income will be used to finance long-term revenue bonds.

The people of San Francisco deserve a first-rate port. We urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote YES on Proposition A.

As Mayor, I have worked hard to restore our port to its historic pre-eminence as a major gateway to the Far East.

Once again, major shipping lines are docking in San Francisco. Just recently, two of the largest container vessel operators, China Ocean Shipping Corporation and Columbus Lines, signed agreements to use this port.

Not only modern cargo carriers, but passenger liners as well are being drawn to San Francisco in a remarkable renaissance of maritime commerce.

But if there is to be a lasting renewal of our waterfront, the port must be competitive with other port cities anxiously contending for the burgeoning Pacific trade. The port, if it is to prosper, must modernize and enlarge its basic maritime facilities.

That's the purpose of Proposition A.

Proposition A will make the Port of San Francisco truly and vigorously competitive. And it will not cost the taxpayers a penny.

Proposition A will authorize $42.5 million in revenue bonds for vital waterfront projects, including the conversion of Pier 80 into a modern, state-of-the-art container facility and the enlargement and modernization of cargo operations at Piers 94 and 96.

Additionally, Proposition A will provide funds for repairing the now deteriorating Jefferson Street Seawall and will match Federal dollars for construction of a much-needed breakwater to protect the City's fishing fleet at Fisherman's Wharf.

Proposition A also will finance expansion of the passenger terminal at Pier 35.

Proposition A is a prudent investment in the City's future. And these bonds are payable only from port revenues—your taxes will not be increased.

More ships, with more cargo and more passengers, mean more jobs and greater economic vitality for our city.

Proposition A will make our port, once again, a strong and lasting competitor for the commerce of the Pacific Basin. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco needs a good, working port. Vote yes on Proposition A and help bring it about.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Citizens of San Francisco are worried about the deterioration of the port. Most of us can remember when the port was a thriving, bustling commercial enterprise, and the docks were maintained, clean, efficient, and busy.

But, the port has not adapted to container cargo, and may be losing the few shipping lines that it now serves.

We must restructure the docks for active container shipping, and bring in railway lines to service the docks.

We have one of the few deep water ports in America, an essential for modern shipping. LET’S DO SOMETHING ABOUT BEING ONE OF THE BEST PORTS IN THE WEST AGAIN!

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Wendy Nelder
President of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will permit the Port of San Francisco to issue bonds to finance needed construction and improvements. This would give the Port the same financing ability the Airport now has.

Through the issuance of revenue bonds, the Port would be able to undertake necessary improvements AT NO COST TO TAXPAYERS.

San Francisco deserves a modern, thriving port. Proposition A will help us build modern terminals, a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf which will help keep commercial fishermen in San Francisco, repair the seawall at Jefferson Street and expand our Passenger Terminal to handle increased cruise business that brings millions of dollars into our local economy.

Proposition A will give the Port of San Francisco the ability to make these kinds of improvements. Please join me in voting YES.

Sala Burton,
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A offers San Franciscans the opportunity to direct the future of the Port of San Francisco.

This measure will provide our Port with the key to the future.

We must keep pace with new developments, increase cargo and create new jobs. For every fifty new containers we move, 1.67 new jobs will be created.

This measure also includes funding for construction of the Fisherman’s Wharf Breakwater, which is critically needed and long overdue.

Take part in the future of our Port. Join with me in voting YES on Proposition A.

Milton Marks,
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a waterfront city. We have a superb natural harbor, which is also one of the few really deep water harbors—vital for modern deep water cargo ships.

We have used our badly deteriorating and long unimproved pier facilities to their maximum efficiency. But . . . times are changing. We must move NOW to keep pace with new developments, or risk enormous losses in cargo shipping, commercial fishing, and tourist trade.

It is ESSENTIAL that we adapt to container cargo that can be moved by train, truck, and ship.

Research has been done on what could give us the greatest increase in efficiency and profits for the very least amount of money. And the answer is: modernizing the South Terminal for adaptation to container cargo; providing rail access to the docks; protecting the commercial fishing fleet with a breakwater; and expanding passenger-handling facilities for cruise passenger tourists.

Prop A will provide these improvements RIGHT NOW. And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION
Arthur H. Coleman, President
James Rudden, Vice President
Gordon Lau, Member
Anne Halsted, Member
James Herman, Member
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fisherman's Wharf is a valued segment of the community and needs your help to ensure its economic well-being.

A YES vote on Proposition A will provide the needed financing to build the long awaited breakwater to ensure the safety of our commercial fishing fleet, create new berths and new jobs.

A YES vote on Proposition A will repair the Jefferson Street Seawall before it becomes a dangerous hazard to our visitors and to our community.

A YES vote will insure the economic vitality of Fisherman's Wharf as well as the entire San Francisco Waterfront.

Join with us and vote YES.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Louis Ferrari, President
Crab Boat Owner’s Association

Christopher Martin
President, Fisherman’s Wharf Merchant Assoc.
Fritz Arko
Alessandro Baccari
Ex. Secretary, Fisherman’s Wharf Merchant Assoc.
L. B. Barnes
Fisherman’s Wharf Seafood
Phil Bentivegna
Fishing Boat Butchie B
Bob Bugatto
California Shell Fish Co.
Ken Burger
Franciscan Restaurant
Pat Flanagan
Standard Fisheries
Anthony Casali
Fishing Boat Norene

Virgil P. Caselli, Native
S. Joseph Cincotta
F. Alioto Fish Co.
Nick D’Amato
Fishing Boat Nicky D
Nino Gerald
Tom Lazio
Tom Lazio Fish Co.
Andrew Lolli
William McDonnell
Albert Spadaro
Sports Fishing Boat
New Flories
Mario J. Alioto
Calif. Seafood Institute
Peter Brown
The Anchorage

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The opportunity is NOW!

Our Northern Waterfront is alive with activity—increase in passenger ships, thriving commercial developments.

Let us fuse that energy into our Southern Waterfront and take advantage of our natural deep water. That means newer, deeper draft merchant ships, increased cargoes and new jobs.

Missed opportunities cannot be recaptured. So act now! Don't let this opportunity get away.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Sec/Treasurer San Francisco Labor Council
Le Roy King
Regional Director ILWU
Tim Twomey, President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trade Council
Chuck Mack, President
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our waterfront is an outstandingly beautiful and profitable aspect of San Francisco. The port has been badly neglected, however. We need to VOTE YES ON PROP A to improve and rebuild cargo and passenger facilities.

PROP A will guarantee increased maritime activities, new jobs, the revival of our fishing industry, and the safety of shoreline areas.

And... AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!

For our neighborhood, and for our City, VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Phyllis Kern
Golden Gate Democratic Club* Open Space Committee*
Jim Wachob
District 8 Democratic Club*
Kevin Malone
District 8 Democratic Club*
Bette Landis
Democratic Women’s Forum*
Rebecca Evans
Sierra Club*
Beverly Karmatz
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown*

Richard Livingston
Adria Garabedian
Andrea Jepson
Madrid Hamilton
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Wallinda McCrea
Douglas Engmann
Dale Carlson
Stafford Buckley
Dick Pabich
Ron Huberman

*for identification purposes only
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a great port city. And the San Francisco Port has always been a leading employer of minorities.

But the Port has sadly deteriorated. It has not kept up with modernizations and improvements. And what is even worse, it has not kept up with the competition. The Port MUST adapt to container cargo, and put in railway access to the docks. With your vote YES ON A, we can take advantage of our deep water harbor, attract more shipping trade, increase cargoes, and produce many more jobs.

And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

J. E. Thomas
A. Brooks
Frankie Gillette
Lois DeCayette
Joel DeCayette
Jule Anderson
Althea Carrie
George Newkirk
Elouise Westbrook
Shirley Jones
Clifton Jeffers
Joe Williams
Carol Belle
Benjamin James
Grandvel Jackson
Amos Brown

Faye Anderson
Zuretti Goosby
Stan Palomares-Criollos
Jene Rita Alviar
Ernest C. Ayala
Alan S. Wong
Stan Moy
Douglas S. Chan
Thomas Hsieh
Alicia Wang
Ben Tom
Pius Lee
Julie Tang
Louis Hop Lee
Dennis Wong
Melvin Dong Lee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our Port now needs $42 million to develop San Francisco's maritime facilities to compete with ports such as Oakland, Seattle and San Diego.

These improved facilities are vital to San Francisco's competition for jobs and trade for the Pacific. Currently all major west coast ports are building to meet the growing needs of America's Pacific Trade. These ports have each spent an average of $57 million on recent container cargo expansion while San Francisco has spent nothing.

San Francisco must have at least comparable facilities in order to compete in this market. If the port is not developed for container cargo, San Francisco can forget about being a major port on the west coast as well as lose the jobs and revenue that a modern port could produce.

The Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that you vote to bring San Francisco the jobs and business that will be created by these revenue bonds. The bonds will be paid off from Port revenue and there is no taxpayer risk.

If you want to see the Port continue to grow and prosper vote yes on Proposition A.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reconstruct municipal harbor facilities!!!:

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

Juanita G. Raven
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committeeman
Bob Geary
Democratic County Committeeman
Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Martin Eng
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

When something is railroaded through City Hall on a "fast track," it is always difficult not to join the stampede. This, however, is a bond issue in an amount larger than necessary to perform the actual work contemplated; not backed by written leases; and not backed even by "letter agreements" with corporations which supposedly will use Piers 80, 94 and 96 if improvements are made. This bond issue was rushed through the Board of Supervisors. Transmitted to the Board on July 24th, a scant six days later (on July 30th) and without a specific noticed public hearing, the Board voted 7-1 to place it on the ballot. I dissented because more time was needed for a proper analysis and public input.

Presently, the Port has a debt service requirement of approximately $104,000,000.00. This proposed revenue bond issue would increase the debt service requirement to $228,261,400.00; a staggering rise. The $42,500,000.00 bond issue would produce but $40,202,000.00 in net proceeds. The Port has a surplus of about $19,000,000.00, of which approximately $15,000,000.00 is available for capital projects. The Controller says $49,254,660.00, would thus be available for capital projects costing $41,610,000.00.

The Port is borrowing $7,644,660.00 more than is needed for these seven capital projects. Why? The Port admits it has no long-term written commitments for Piers 80, 94 and 96 which account for $37,570,000.00 of the total bond issue. How can we be assured that the bondholders will be repaid by revenues from those piers if there are no long-term commitments?

Moreover, the Port hasn't even secured written "letter agreements" from corporations to assure that if those improvements are made, they will sign long-term commitments. Ironically, but $4,000,000.00 of the bond issue would be spent on needed improvements for Fisherman's Wharf tenants, who generate almost 50% of net Port income, money which would be used to repay the money borrowed for Piers 80, 94 and 96. It's like the tail wagging the dog.

Selling bonds is nothing more than borrowing money. Why borrow more money than you have to, and why borrow money for projects which don't have long-term tenants? Be assured that even if this passes, I intend to persist in making Port officials answer those very questions.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

MOTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION A

MOTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A MEASURE AUTHORIZING THE PORT COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS TO FINANCE THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION OF CERTAIN PORT FACILITIES TO BE LOCATED AT THE PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby orders submitted to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 6, 1984 a measure authorizing the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to issue revenue bonds, all as set forth in the following measure, to wit:

Shall the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $42,500,000 the proceeds of which will be used to modernize container handling facilities and to upgrade various other maritime-oriented facilities at the Port of San Francisco's piers 35, 80, 94 and 96 and at the Jefferson Street seawall, to construct a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf, to construct an intermodal container transfer facility, to install a backflow prevention system at various locations, to replace various transformers and capacitors throughout the port, and to acquire, construct or renovate certain works, property or structures necessary or convenient for the operation of, and at, the Port of San Francisco, which facilities are operated by the Port Commission?

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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Water Revenue Bonds

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?  

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission operates the San Francisco Water Department. When the Commission needs funds to acquire, improve or develop Water Department facilities, it may issue revenue bonds to raise the funds. Before the Commission can issue revenue bonds, a majority of the voters must approve. The revenue bonds are then paid from Water Department revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds. Funds from the sale of the bonds would be used to acquire, improve or develop facilities necessary for the operation of the Water Department, including filtration plants and reservoirs. The bonds would be paid off from the revenues of the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance Water Department improvements.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Public Utilities Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$104,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>169,260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt service requirement</td>
<td>$273,260,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Based on a five year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning one year after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $3,467,000 to a maximum of $14,022,000 annually for thirty-one years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Water Department revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Water Department sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Water Department. Analysis of projected resources available to the Water Department indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on a resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 62.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The money from these bonds will be used to assure that drinking water we take from our Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs on the Peninsula is pure and meets all health standards. The bonds will be repaid from revenues of our Water Department. Not a penny will be charged on the property tax rolls or to the general taxpayers.

We have two huge lakes along side I-280 on the Peninsula, the Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs. About 15% of our drinking water in normal times comes from these lakes and others in Alameda County. For decades we used this water without filtration. Now, however, health officials tell us that all of the water from our Peninsula lakes must be filtered before it can be used. We now have a very limited filtering capacity which means that if, for any reason, our water supply from the Sierras were interrupted or reduced and we would need more local water, we would be unable to make full use of Crystal Springs water. There now is no filter plant at Crystal Springs. Whatever water we use from there must be pumped up to a small filtration plant at San Andreas before it can enter the system. This very severely limits the amount of drinking water we can draw from our nearest supply, and it is expensive. Passage of Proposition B would change all that.

By voting YES on B, you will provide for water system improvements including a new filtration plant right at Crystal Springs, for the expansion of the small plant at San Andreas, and for a necessary storage reservoir.

Your YES on B vote is an investment in the quality of our drinking water—an assurance that water from our nearest supply will be available to us pure, meeting all health requirements, when we need it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Generations ago, San Franciscans had the foresight to build one of the most magnificent water systems in the world—Hetch Hetchy, which brings water to San Francisco from the High Sierras.

Now, we must modernize the system to keep pace with higher standards of water quality.

Proposition B will authorize the San Francisco Water Department to issue $104 million in revenue bonds.

The money will be used to improve the system by expanding existing plants and by building additional filtration, treatment and holding facilities on Water Department properties on the Peninsula.

These facilities will provide safe drinking water for future generations of San Franciscans. Presently, if any of the existing facilities suffered a breakdown, the City could be forced to rely upon unfiltered water from Crystal Springs. The State Department of Public Health has directed the Water Department to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Our water is safe. It meets all state and Federal quality standards, and we want to keep it that way. Proposition B will assure low turbidity (silt content), reduce asbestos content, and prevent the spread of giardia lamblia, a virus not now found in our water system, but which could be brought in as watershed areas become more populated.

Proposition B, which will not have any effect on our tax structure, is a prudent investment, protecting our drinking water into the future. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote yes on Proposition B and help guarantee us pure, plentiful water.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED
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PROPOSITION C

Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

YES 259

NO 260

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Department of Public Health operates the county hospitals, such as San Francisco General and Laguna Honda, and all other county public health services. The Department is run by a Public Health Director, who is appointed by the City's Chief Administrative Officer and who is responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would create a Health Commission, and place the Department of Public Health under the control of the Commission. The Commission would have seven members, appointed by the Mayor; no more than three members would be doctors, nurses, hospital administrators or other health care professionals. The Commission would appoint a Public Health Director, responsible to the Commission, to administer the Department. The Public Health Director could appoint and remove deputies to help administer the Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of a Health Commission appointed by the Mayor, and to be run by a Public Health Director, appointed by the Health Commission.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of the Chief Administrative Officer and to be run by a Public Health Director appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs of the Health Department, by approximately $8,400 per year."
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Public Health Department has a budget of over $270 million and a staff of 5,000, making it the largest agency in City government. Its responsibilities are many and far-reaching: San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital; emergency medical services; mental health services; sanitation; public health education; district health centers; inspection of public and private facilities. The list is long and growing.

In recent years, the list of problems facing departmental administrators has, unfortunately, also grown. Emergency Aid stations were closed. Ambulance service was drastically altered. Proposals to reorganize community mental health services were promoted and rejected, causing confusion for all. The AIDS crisis. The investigations at San Francisco General Hospital. And on and on.

Too often, these decisions and these issues were considered in a vacuum, without public input, without public debate, and without public scrutiny.

Why? In order to protect the Department of Public Health from the graft and corruption that plagued our City at the turn of the century, the Charter placed the department under the Chief Administrative Officer’s auspices rather than a commission. Fifty years later, the department has outgrown this cumbersome arrangement. It is time to bring the administration of this important agency into the 20th Century, mirroring the management of other City departments.

Proposition C will establish a seven-member Health Commission, appointed by the Mayor, to set policy and supervise the Public Health Department. The commission will include both providers and consumers of health services. It will bring the Department more directly under the Mayor’s control, allowing for more timely responses to issues and problems. Most importantly, it will ensure that the department is publicly accountable for its actions.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Public health policy has changed and the governance of our public health department must change too.

In the past few years the state and federal governments have shifted more and more of the responsibility for public health management to local governments.

Recent experience shows that our health department is not presently equipped to manage public health programs in the most effective manner.

Proposition C will streamline management—cutting two levels of bureaucracy while opening up our public health policy to the public itself.

I urge a “yes” vote on Proposition C.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Since 1971, the Department of Public Health has been plagued with problems and crises at its hospitals, clinics and emergency aid stations. Most recently, we again faced the threat of San Francisco General losing its accreditation. These many incidents are deeply disturbing, raising troubling questions in the public mind: Why do these problems persist? Why can’t something be done about them once and for all?

In 1979, the national organization that accredits all hospitals reported that San Francisco General’s “major problems... are related to the lack of an effective governing body free from the political decision-making process which results in delayed activity, inadequate funding, etc.” Last January, the State auditors also cited the absence of “a governing body legally responsible for hospital governance” as a cause for “ineffective management.”

No other hospital in California operates without a board of directors. Only one other department in San Francisco (Public Works) operates without a commission. Instead, San Francisco General and the Health Department are run by a bureaucracy, insulated from public accountability.

Proposition C establishes a commission for the Health Department, one that will hold public hearing, make public decisions, and be publicly accountable. Vote YES.

Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Doris Ward

Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

(Continued)
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Health Commission

Supervisor John Molinari
Hon. John Morrissey
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Douglas Engmann
Hon. Edward Fleischell
Hon. Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Hon. Gordon Lau
Hon. Esta Soler
Hon. Louis Giraudo

Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Richard Guggenheim
Hon. Joe Jung
Hon. John Sanger
Hon. Jean Korum
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Linda Eberth
Hon. Judith Brecka

Hon. Carlota DelPortillo
Hon. Jo Daly
Hon. Drucilla Ramey
Hon. Walter Jebe
Hon. Bette Landis
Hon. Dr. Yoshiio Nakashima
Hon. Samuel Chung
Hon. Louis Hop Lee
Hon. Dale Carlson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's population is aging. In a few short years, a greater percentage of our citizens will be seniors—most living independently on fixed incomes, many frail and over 75—than those of other California cities. They will need nutritional information, home health care, and a broad range of coordinated social services.

The Department of Health, San Francisco General, Laguna Honda, the District Health Centers—these are critical providers of senior services. And as more and more state and federal programs are shifted to local agencies, the Department's role and responsibilities will dramatically increase.

How will the Department respond to this increased responsibility? How can we ensure that it will develop policies and programs that meet seniors' needs? And how can we be sure that these programs operate efficiently and effectively?

Proposition C is a big step in the right direction. VOTE YES!

Kathleen Lammers
Abraham Biderman
Jeanette Harris
Larry Bernardini, R.N.
Nancy Boughey, M.S.W.
David Lally, M.S.W.
Ollie Mae Black
Stephen Graham

Mary O'Connor
Miriam Toback
Sarah Brooks
Colette Hughes
Doron Weinberg
Oscar Toback
Miriam Blaustein

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is important for women.

Women provide the majority of services offered by the Health Department. Indeed public health is traditionally the domain of women and nurses. And while the many crises at General are too often blamed on nursing care, nurses virtually have no role in planning or organizing service delivery.

Women are also the major consumers of the Department's services. As more and more block grants transfer health programs from the state and federal levels to local governments, the Department will become an increasingly important provider to women.

Proposition C gives women an opportunity to make their voices heard at the highest levels of the Health Department. And our voices must be heard if services are to be organized efficiently and responsibly.

Golden Gate Nurses Association
San Francisco N.O.W.
B. J. Badertscher, R.N.M.S.
Ellen Wolfe, R.N.P.N.P.
Suzanne Harris, L.V.N., R.N.
Annie Borgenicht, L.V.N.
Shea Watkins, L.V.N.
Pamela Klein, R.P.T.
Catherine M. Coleman, R.N.
Ellen Shaffer
Conrad Aleksandrowski, L.V.N.
Carmen Melero, L.V.N.
Denise Hunt, M.S.N.
Christina Feltus, N.P.
Mary E. Foley, R.N.

Louise Ogden
Lorraine R. Wiles
Elaine Adamson, M.P.H.
Barbara Engmann, R.N.
Ann Gonski
Ellen Roberts
Katherine Lambert
Catherine J. Dodd, R.N.
Priscilla Alexander
Sharlyn Saslafsky
Gail Dolson, R.N.
Laura Campbell
Flora A. Hurley
Cherie V. James
Judith Kurtz

Aurora Garcia
Tracey Cosgrove
Sally Martin, C.C.S.W.
Alexis Gonzales
Velma V. Gaines
Lili T. Davis
Ruth O'Brien-McMullen, R.N.
Shelley Spiro, R.N.
Arlene Carden, R.N.
Robin Dushane
Laurie Carlson
Janet Veatch, R.N.
Barbara Burges, R.N.M.S.

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

The policies governing San Francisco General affect every consumer and provider of health services in the City, yet there is little accountability to San Francisco taxpayers. No private hospital with General's size and influence operates without a board of trustees or directors. Indeed, no private organization of any kind with a $270 million annual budget—business, corporation, non-profit foundation, whatever—operates without a governing board. Why does General?

As General bounces from one crisis to the next, with state and federal agencies threatening increasingly drastic actions, the weakness of the current management structure becomes clear to all. The Hospital and the Health Department need a commission, where public hearings can surface problems and issues in a timely fashion; where policies can be developed with the cooperation of private providers and consumers. The Health Commission will not be a watchdog meddling in day-to-day affairs, but an advocate for General, one providing continuity, stability and a rational decision-making process with regular rules and procedures.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Rolland Lowe, M.D.
Past President, San Francisco Medical Society
Robert Aaron, M.D.
Robert Gross, M.D.
Molly Coye, M.D.
Robert Koshiyama, D.D.S.
Maureen Katz, M.D.
Yoshio Nakashima, D.D.S.
James Cole, M.D.
John Good, M.D.
Jeff Sandler, M.D.
Judy Keeven, M.D.
Robert Dickter, D.D.S.
Jeffrey Draslin, M.D.
Gabriel Escobar, M.D.
Brad Evans, M.D.
Lars Erickson, M.D.
Randy Yanda, M.D.
Stephen Collins, M.D.
Lewis Pepper, M.D.
Mark Smith, M.D.
Donald Goldmacher, M.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is obligated to ensure that all San Francisco communities have access to medical services. The AIDS crisis brought the health care needs of gay men to the forefront of public discussion. It brought home the importance of a Department flexible and responsive to quickly emerging needs and epidemics, one capable of quickly reallocating resources to dire community needs.

The general health needs of gay men and women, however, are largely unrecognized. The Health Commission will give our community the voice it needs in the health planning processes. It will ensure that the diversity of our City is represented in the consideration of these important issues.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli
John Mehring
Del Martin
Donald Cataland
Cleve Jones
Randy Stallings
Ron Huberman
Richard Allman
Jeff Jones
Phyllis Lyon
Debra Friedland
Robert Esteves

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Hispanics in San Francisco strongly support Proposition C, the Health Commission Charter Amendment. Health is vital to the Latino Community of San Francisco. We are a younger population, with larger families and with special health needs, such as those of Central American refugees. In recent years, federal and state funding for health programs has decreased, leaving community health programs in a difficult financial situation. Recent changes in Medically Indigent Adult services have negatively impacted our community.

In addition, the need for better and expanded bilingual medical services continues to be a top priority in San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition C.

Celso Ortiz
Rafael Cedillos
Maria Degado
Roberto Hernandez
Joanna Devito-Larson
Rosa Maria Clos
Susan Houston
Arnell Rodrigues
P. Braveman, M.D.
Alfredo Rodrigues
Sonia Melara
Joseph Tanner
Edgar Quiroz
Angel Coutreras
Roger Hernandez
Tom Romero
Raphael Taliaferro
Juanita DelCarlo
Juan Pifarre
Rudolph Mathias
Rolph Hurtado
Alfredo Rivas
Vilma Mondoza
O. Bracker
Ray Rivera
Lorenzo Dill
Yolanda Cameros
Monica Asturias
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Health Commission

Sydney Furman
Carlos Castrillo
Leroy Jaquez
Estalla Lara
Ricardo Hernandez
Igor Kalinovsky, M.D.
Bayra Matias
Andres Sendin
Consuelo Payes
Guadalupe Cuellar
Esperanza Martinez
Manuel Larez
Esperanzo Echavarri
Stan Palomares-Criollo
Jene Alvin
Antonia Sacchetti
Maria Chavez
Maria Scineux
Alicia Hopkinson
Cleta Fernandez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The chief opposition to Proposition C comes from two sources: The Chief Administrative Officer and the officials of the University of California Medical Center. The CAO’s opposition is understandable. He simply doesn’t want to lose control of the Health Department and SF General.

UC’s opposition is more puzzling, until you realize that it receives $10-15 million from the City each year for staffing at General Hospital without a publicly reviewed contract! Why is UC afraid of having its relationship with General publicly scrutinized by a Health Commission? Let’s clear the air. Vote YES on Proposition C.

Puttie Fong
Ina Dearman
Patrick Flanagan
Douglas Engmann
Ellen Roberts
Christopher Martin
Tom Moore
Henry Der

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

We support Proposition C. Beatrice Patterson
Fred Ross
James O’Connor
Dale Carlson
Pamela Duffy
Gerald Yoachum
D.J. Soviero
Rosalind Wolf
Gordon Brownell
Jim Wachob
Steven Krefting
JoAnne Miller
Maura Kealey
Margaret O’Driscoll
Nicerita Revelo
Paul Vacaralli
Thomas Ambrogi
Arlo Hale Smith
Dian Blomquist
Thomas Moore
Peter Hanson
Jack Morrison
Mary Vail
Sally Osaki
Linda Post
Terrance Farr
Ken Mc Eldowney
Sue Hestor
Willie Gee, D.D.S.
Agar Jaicks
John Holtclaw

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Community clinics provide thousands of San Franciscans with access to essential primary health care and preventive health services. Yet, these community-based institutions, as well as the neighborhoods and people they represent, have been excluded from participation in health policy decision-making in San Francisco. Excluded, too, is any public debate on alternatives to hospital-based health delivery and financing systems that could prove cost-effective and could better serve the people of San Francisco.

Proposition C, The Health Commission Charter Amendment, offers a forum for public discussion of local health policy issues. By giving the neighborhoods and communities input into health policy decisions, the Health Commission will enable San Franciscans to create a new community of interest and new community of action in the area of health service delivery.

VOTE YES on PROPOSITION C.

San Francisco Community Clinic Consortium
Myles Dixon
George Dykstra
Susan Ehrlich
Patricia Franks
Debra Friedland
Kate Lambert
Mike Pincus
David Smith, M.D.
Marjin Waukazoo
Jerome West
Sophie Wong

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

The Health Commission will be of vital importance to the Asian community. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Dr. Yoshio Nakashima
Louis Hop Lee
Samuel Chung

David Yamakawa
Ernest Wu
Joe Jung
George Suncin
Sophie Wong
Pattie Fong
Willie Gee, D.D.S.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is a key source of medical services in the black community, both directly through General Hospital and the district health centers, and indirectly through community and mental health clinics. But our special problems—an infant mortality rate significantly above rates in other Bay Area counties, for example—are not often heard by the Department's policy-makers, for they are insulated and isolated from our community.

Our concerns must be heard if they are to be ad-
dressed. Proposition C gives us a platform from which to speak. Vote YES.

Elouise Westbrook
Yvonne Golden
Lorenzo R. Dill
Zuretti L. Goosby, D.D.S
Julianne Malveaux
Eugene Coleman
Naomi T. Gray

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This proposal to put politics into the Department of Public Health by creating a "commission" to direct it is an example of the misguided philosophy of attacking governmental problems by throwing bureaucracy at them. It should be soundly defeated. Currently, the City's health officials report to one person, the Chief Administrative Officer, who can respond swiftly to any crisis and set consistent policy. The responsibility for the Department lies with the CAO, not a group of political appointees. When our Charter was adopted in 1932, the freeholders explained the rationale of giving the CAO management responsibility over the Health Department. The idea was "to provide reasonable safeguards AGAINST POLITICAL MANIPULATION." (Emphasis added) Their report stated the office of CAO was designed to be "protected from political influence as largely as possible ..." and "it is intended that this officer shall be entirely independent in discharging the function of

the office, and particularly, to be free from interference of the mayor, because the latter is subjected to political influence." Although the Charter was adopted in 1932, its logic still makes powerful sense. Besides blurring lines of responsibility, this iniquitous proposal contradicts health management practices in California and the United States. In fact, the same idea was evaluated in 1971 by a committee established by the supervisors, which concluded that the commission concept, a "seemingly attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another bureaucratic layer in an already cluttered city administrative structure." To paraphrase The Progress, the Muni is the best proof that "the presence of a commission does not guarantee good management." Vote NO on Proposition C.

Supervisor 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.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The enactment of Proposition C would set the clock back on health care delivery in San Francisco to the 1920s. As proposed, the measure would almost exactly duplicate the system of Health Care abandoned by The City in 1932 because it had become corrupt, politicized and incapable of effectively responding to the growing challenges of modern health care administration.

In 1973 the Board of Supervisors itself considered and rejected a similar Health Commission option. The board's reason was that commissions do not make effective management tools. "The Commission, seemingly an attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another layer in an already cluttered City administrative structure."

The commission concept also goes counter to sound health management practices. Earlier this year, a team of top Bay Area health care professionals was asked to identify the leading municipal hospitals in the country. None of the institutions identified uses a commission form of administration largely because commissions, while perhaps capable of overseeing some urban systems such as mass transit, have proven ineffective and cumbersome.

The argument has been advanced that a commission would allow for greater citizen input into the health department. The fact is that the Department of Health already has some 440 individuals serving on 27 Citizen Advisory Committees—more than with any other city department. The proposed seven member commission would be insufficient in both size and technical competence to do other than deal with the health care in San Francisco on a "crisis-to-crisis" basis.

As we move into the 21st Century, the administration of San Francisco's health care systems will only become more challenging. A form of governance that proved inadequate 50 years ago and was rejected by the Board of Supervisors eleven years ago as inappropriate, is not the best way to provide for our city's health care needs of the future. We urge you to vote "No" on Proposition C.

Dr. Frank Lewis, Chief of Staff, San Francisco General Hospital
Walter Newman, Overseer, UCSF
Yori Wada, UC Board of Regents
Dr. Frank Curry, Former Director of Public Health
Dr. Frank Sooy, Chancellor Emeritus, UCSF
Virginia Leishman, Director of Nursing, Laguna Honda Hospital

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

A vote for Proposition C is a vote to politicize health care in San Francisco. The authors of the 1932 City Charter foresaw this when they abolished the city's highly politicized seven member health commission and placed the Department of Health under the jurisdiction of the Chief Administrative Officer. Proposition C would return San Francisco to the pre-1932 system of politicized health care management.

In writing the 1932 Charter, the authors recognized the need to balance executive authority by splitting it between the Mayor and the CAO. Departments, such as health, which were thought to be best managed if protected from direct political influence, were placed under the jurisdiction of the CAO, who is appointed for a fixed 10 year term to remove the office from political pressure.

Despite the occurrence of problems the system has worked well. San Francisco General has perhaps the best Trauma Unit in the country. The hospital's AIDS unit is unquestionably the best and most humane in the nation.

Moving control of the city's health care budget from the Chief Administrative Officer to the Executive will create a "strong mayor" type of government which the Charter was designed to prevent. Health commissioners would necessarily be beholden to the political factions or individuals which lobbied for their appointment and to the mayor who appoints them.

There are alternatives to a Health Commission. Several have already been recommended by a blue ribbon panel of health management experts appointed following the report on General Hospital. We believe these recommendations and perhaps others, including a variation on the health commission concept, deserve further study.

Proposition C would bring about a radical restructuring of government and health care delivery in San Francisco. Both issues are far too important to be decided hastily. We urge a No vote on Proposition C.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, President, Board of Supervisors
Florette White Pomeroy, Consultant
William K. Coblenz, Attorney
Thomas E. Horn, VP, Board of Trustees, War Memorial
J. Gary Shansby, Chairman of the Board, Shaklee Corporation
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I oppose Proposition C because:
1. It puts the Health Department under the control of politically appointed non-professionals. I cannot agree that this should be done. It brings in politics and throws out expertise.
2. It adds an extra layer of bureaucracy making government more expensive and management more difficult.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Your City Hall representatives would have you believe that by replacing our present Health System with a Health Commission, composed of seven members, at a recompense of $100 per month, will improve the services.

Hogwash. Just another layer of government.

With a budget of $270 millions, 5000 employees would you put your faith in the hands of seven and still maintain the same Health Director?

What we need is a clean sweep of the present management; new faces; new ideas. The Charter provides for this, let's do it—"Now," not later.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION C

Marguerite A. Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

By creating a health commission for the Public Health Department, the city of San Francisco would create more problems rather than solve them.

Past experience has indicated a need to separate politics from health care. San Francisco would be turning the clock back to a situation in the 1920s when the city had a seven member commission appointed by the Mayor that oversaw the management of the Public Health Department. The delivery of effective health care was seriously compromised by the politicized department which was a direct consequence of the department's health commission.

For this reason, the citizens of San Francisco at that time passed a charter reform that removed the Health Department from the politically appointed commission and placed it in a newly created Chief Administrative Officer who would be secured against political pressures.

The creation of the Health Commission would take 40% of the budget of the Chief Administrative Officer's budget and place it under the control of a politically appointed Commission, thus negating the intent of the Chief Administrative Officer's Department which was created to administer departments that should be removed from political concerns.

Do not politicize San Francisco's health care. Vote No on Proposition C.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electric, Public Health, and County Agricultural Department; Health Advisory Board; Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the

(Continued on page 82)
Retirement Board Investments

PROPOSITION D
Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?

YES 261
NO 262

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement Board has complete authority to invest the funds of the Retirement System for city employees. The Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would remove the requirement that the Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California. Instead, the proposition would require the Retirement Board to make investments with the care and skill that a prudent person would make under similar circumstances.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the way the Retirement Board invests pension money. Instead of making only those investments which are legal for insurance companies, the Board would be able to make any investments that a prudent person would make.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Retirement Board to keep making only the same kind of investments which are legal for insurance companies.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-5 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.


Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, increase the cost of government. However, as a result of its authorizing additional flexibility for investments, earnings may be higher or lower than what could have occurred absent this amendment.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 63.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote YES on Proposition D.

The purpose of Proposition D is to clarify the investment responsibility of the Retirement Board and to add language express to comply with the newly enacted State Constitutional amendment on fiduciary standards for public pension plans (Proposition 21, June 1984).

Since 1932, the charter has referred to the Insurance Code as the guideline for pension investments.

Insurance Code investment requirements are unsuitable to current pension fund investment practices and severely restrict the ability of the Retirement Board to manage the fund to achieve the best possible investment return for the City and County of San Francisco and the members of the Retirement System.

The added new language will establish firm guidelines for the Retirement Board to discharge its responsibility as the fiduciary for the Retirement Fund. This new language will also serve as increased protection for members of the Retirement System by applying recognized fiduciary standards for which there is considerable statutory and case law.

In summary, the proposed charter amendment serve a dual purpose: it removes obsolete and ambiguous language and brings the Retirement System into compliance with the State Constitution. Both changes will enhance and improve the System's investment capabilities and the ability to achieve its goals and objectives.

Proposition D is endorsed and supported by the Retirement Board and the Board of Supervisors.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This is a worthwhile Charter amendment which updates obsolete and ambiguous provisions on how the Retirement Board can invest funds. It institutes standards consistent with a recent voter-approved amendment to the California Constitution. Investment practices have been refined dramatically in the past 50 years, and income and appreciation choices have increased tremendously. The investment professionals working for the Retirement System now are prevented from making the very most prudent investments possible, and City employees and taxpayers are, thus, prejudiced and hurt.

Present investment rules are based upon the State Insurance Code, which contravenes contemporary investment practices. Proposition D will give more latitude in making high-return investments, but will also retain vigorous guidelines on investment of Retirement System funds while increasing the protection of City employees. It will save money for taxpayers by enabling a better return on Retirement System assets. It's logical. That's why I recommend a "yes" vote.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or modifications are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by strike-through type.

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive, and may continue to receive, benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies in California.

The retirement board shall discharge its duties with respect to the system with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with these matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like aims.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ____________________________________________

Address ________________________________________  Apt. # ______

Telephone No. (required) ___________________________

Do you have an automobile?  yes □  no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) _______________________

Signature __________________________________________
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PROPOSITION E

Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?

YES 264
NO 265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a health care fund for active and retired employees. The City's contribution to this fund equals the average amount contributed to health care funds for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco. The City does not contribute anything for spouses of active or retired employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would provide that the City contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the health care fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Bill Maher.

Controller's Statement on “E”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs and present membership data of the Health Service System, in excess of $990,000 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 67.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This charter amendment calls for extending a limited measure of aid from the City and County of San Francisco for the health care of the surviving spouse of an active or retired City employee.

Under existing statute, the City and County and its employees, active or retired, share the cost of health care for the employee, their spouse and children. However, upon the death of the employee, the City and County's share of payments to the health care system stops.

Thus, the surviving spouse is compelled to pick up the entire cost for the health care plan while struggling to survive on a reduced family income and, at the same time, contend with ever increasing medical/hospital expenses and everyday living costs for themselves and eligible family dependents.

Proposition E will allow the City and County to continue paying its share into the health care system and not force the surviving spouse and eligible family dependents to assume the entire financial burden for health care payments.

Since the number of surviving spouses affected is very small, less than 1400, the cost to the taxpayer for the City and County is minimal.

The changes proposed by Proposition E should have been made many years ago; it is long overdue. We urge you to support this important measure.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Justice tempered with compassion. VOTE YES. Surviving spouses of City workers receive an automatic 50% cut in retirement pay upon the death of their partners. Why further burden this small group by withdrawing subsidy for health care?

The Retirement System actuary has officially confirmed that the average pension check for this group is $300.00 per month; incidentally, below the nationally quoted poverty level.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by William T. Reed, Chairman Legislative Committee, Retired Employees City & County of San Francisco Helen McAtee, Chairperson Philip Kearney, President, and retired manager of the Health Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Health Service Board which administers the health benefits provided to active and retired employees and their dependents fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the surviving spouse upon the death of a retired employee.

This financial problem is especially acute because a surviving spouse’s pension is cut by 50% at the death of the employee and because of the high cost of medical insurance. Medical cost increases have outpaced general inflation rates over the last three (3) years by about two to one.

We urge your “YES” vote on Proposition “E” on the basis of need and equity.

Abraham Bernstein, M.D., President Health Service Board of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Surviving spouses of city employees need this for a relatively comfortable widowhood. Let’s extend a small measure of consideration to those who are left on their own.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Proposition E if approved would require the city to subsidize the health premiums of the surviving spouses of non-uniformed city employees. The cost to the city would amount to $990,000 per year and give city employees a benefit that is not normally enjoyed by workers in private industry.

The majority of private employees have health plans that allow surviving spouses to be members of such plans but the employer does not subsidize the premiums of these survivors in anyway. Being permitted to join a group plan that provides comprehensive coverage at a reasonable rate is a sufficient benefit in and of itself.

If this amendment is approved it will violate the spirit of the Charter provision that sets city employee salaries and benefits at the average of that which prevails in the metropolitan Bay Area. We believe in fair treatment and compensation for city employees and our current rules provide exactly that.

Vote No on Proposition E.
John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

The city and county, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, and June 6, 1984 shall be effective July 1, 1973, and July 1, 1985.
Employee Death Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?

YES 267
NO 268

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, who is a member of the Retirement System is entitled to a death benefit of six months salary if he or she dies, regardless of cause, before retirement. The benefit is paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would provide that if an officer or employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, is injured through external and violent means in the course of employment and the employee dies within 180 days of the injury, an additional benefit of 12 months salary would be paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to pay an additional benefit of 12 months salary to a city employee who dies from an injury caused by external and violent means in the course of employment.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to provide an additional death benefit to these city employees who die from external and violent means in the course of employment.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the number of employees and their respective salary rates which qualify for payment under the provisions of this proposed amendment. Based on experience to date, the cost of this additional amount should not be substantial.”
Employee Death Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F provides a small compensation for the survivor of a city employee (non Police or Fire) killed in the line of duty. Let's agree to this minor expenditure for the survivors of those who have died in city service.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Only rarely is a city employee killed in the line of duty, but death can come with fierce suddenness.

Two Muni workers were crushed by cable car machinery in 1978; the following year, two Water Department employees were murdered at the Lake Merced Pumping Station; and in March 1981, a Hetch Hetchy lineman fell to his death.

For the families of the vast majority of city workers, there is little protection when death comes. Police officers and fire fighters already have special death benefits.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Proposition F is designed to correct a serious inequity on behalf of miscellaneous members of the Retirement System who are killed in line of duty or who die as a result of a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury.

Under current charter provisions, a designated beneficiary of a member who dies in the course of employment from any cause receives the member's contributions to the system, plus six months' salary.

Proposition F focuses only on those members who are killed in the line of duty or who die within 180 days from a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury. Beneficiaries of such members will be accorded an additional insurance benefit of twelve months' salary.

The payment of additional compensation to a designated beneficiary will be subject to the independent hearing officer process as set forth in the City charter.

Proposition F is fair and equitable and, based on actuarial projections, the cost is minimal.

Proposition F is sponsored and endorsed by the Retirement Board, unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, and strongly supported by Mayor Dianne Feinstein.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

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

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

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

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

(Continued on page 84)
Police Probationary Period

**PROPOSITION G**

Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks? 

YES 270 
NO 271

---

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** Police officers entering the Police Department serve a one-year probationary period. During the first 32 weeks, the police officer goes through the police training program. After successfully completing training, the officer is then assigned to regular police duties. The Police Department has 20 weeks to evaluate the officer while on regular police duty. After this 20 week period, the probation is complete.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition G would extend the probationary period of the police officer to one year after the completion of the training. In no event would it extend the probationary period beyond 84 weeks from the date of entry. Any termination for breach of duty or misconduct would require charges and a hearing before the Police Commission.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the probationary period for a police officer to be extended to one year after completing the police training course but not to exceed 84 weeks.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want the probationary period for a police officer to remain one year after the date of entry into the department.

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “G”**

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

---

**Controller’s Statement on “G”**

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

---

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Your YES vote for this amendment will enable the Police Department to provide more effective police services by ensuring that after officers graduate from the Academy and complete a field training program, an adequate probationary evaluation period exists to determine an officer's fitness to perform police duties. Society demands much from its police officers. As the nature of police work has become increasingly complex, training and performance evaluation functions must meet the needs of an ever-evolving profession.

Great expenditure of time and money are invested in training police officers. Presently, if a recruit is not deemed ready for duty, the probationary period can be completed during any retraining, thus making it difficult and costly to determine ultimate fitness for duty.

By voting YES, you will give the Chief of Police time necessary to adequately train and evaluate an officer's performance and to better ensure quality police services.

The Police Department has met and conferred with the Police Officers' Association regarding this amendment and has obtained that organization's support for its passage.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition G.

In recent years, because San Francisco has had the financial strength to do so, we've steadily expanded the size of the Police Department.

It is now the largest ever, with 1987 officers.

More and more officers are being assigned to our neighborhoods on beats and in patrolcars. We want the best officers possible.

That's why Proposition G is so important. It will give the Department greater ability to screen out officers who do not measure up to the strict standards of professionalism this city demands.

Proposition G will extend the probation period for a new officer to one complete year following completion of his or her field training.

Presently, probation starts when an officer is first inducted into the Department, before 18 weeks of class work in the City's outstanding Police Academy and another 14 weeks of field training.

As strenuous as the class work and the training may be, the real test of an officer is on the street.

That's where his or her coolness, competence and compassion—in fact, all the qualities that this city wants in a superior police department—can be observed and tested.

Proposition G will give the department a full year to evaluate an officer in uniform and on the job.

Those who don't measure up can be dismissed after a departmental hearing. Protected will be the City's rightful concern that our police officers can truly be described as the City's finest.

Proposition G is a common-sense measure, sought by the Chief of Police, that will strengthen the San Francisco Police Department. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Police commanders need more time to evaluate the recruits' "street" performance. Proposition G does that by extending the on-the-job probationary period up to one year. For the sake of our children, neighbors and all San Franciscans, I want to be sure that a police officer is fully competent from a practical standpoint, not merely because of a classroom perspective. Therefore, I support Proposition G, and I urge you to vote for it, too.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Police Motorcycle Pay

PROPOSITION H

Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?

YES 274
NO 275

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and who are assigned to the Traffic Division get bonus pay. Police officers who ride motorcycles as part of their job, but who are assigned to duties other than traffic, do not get bonus pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would give all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job to get the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want only those San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and are assigned to the Traffic Division to get bonus pay.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current rates of pay, staffing and assignments by the police department, the cost of government would be increased by approximately $74,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Honda Motorcycle Unit of the San Francisco Police Department has, because of antiquated charter language, been denied payment of the hazard pay which is currently given the two-wheel motorcycle officers in the Traffic Division.

Because the primary function of the Honda Motorcycle Unit is crime fighting and not traffic enforcement, the word “traffic” must be deleted from the charter in order to compensate equally all officers who perform hazardous motorcycle duty.

Please join us in voting YES for this very fair charter amendment.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

In 1970, the San Francisco Police Department created a unit of light weight motorcycles to patrol Golden Gate Park and the beaches surrounding the City. In 1977 these duties were drastically changed to counteract rising street crimes around the Western Addition. Neighborhood associations, seeing the effectiveness of the unit, also requested additional patrols by these motorcycle officers. Since 1977 the Honda Unit (as it is known now) has been assigned to virtually every neighborhood in the City to reduce purse snatches, “red light” robberies, drag racing, and street narcotics traffic, along with demonstrations, marches, parades, and sporting events all over the City.

Also occurring since 1977 have been injuries to these highly visible, highly vulnerable motorcycle officers. Some of these injuries include one officer hit head on, and another officer suffering a leg broken by an auto which ran a red light. There have been numerous officers struck by other vehicles causing injuries, and injuries due to other road hazards (oil slicks, pothole etc.). These have increased sharply since the Honda Unit has been assigned to primarily street patrol. One officer was shot twice while patrolling the Western Addition for purse snatchers.

It is obvious that these officers are no longer “just” patrolling the parks and beaches as they were initially intended, but are now assigned to patrol the streets of the most crime-ridden areas of the City combating street crimes and enforcing traffic laws. These officers on prior occasions have requested Motorcycle Hazard Pay (which traffic enforcement two-wheel motorcycle officers already receive) for their patrol of these neighborhoods and streets on the two-wheel motorcycles but have been denied because of outdated wording in the Charter. Passage of this amendment would correct this inequity.

Al Casciato
President, S.F.P.O.A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

All police officers who ride motorcycles in the course of duty face special danger and deserve the premium pay already allowed for motorcycle traffic officers.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

A police officer on a two-wheeler is often the first on the scene of a major crime or emergency. Day after day, there is no more hazardous duty for our police.

Whether on a motorcycle in pursuit of a felon on city streets, or on a motorbike on patrol in the remote areas of the City's parklands, an officer lives with danger. Because they can cut through traffic, the two-wheelers often are first to arrive at a shooting or bank robbery or car crash.

The City Charter has long recognized the dangers inherent in this essential police work and has provided hazard-pay for motorcycle officers of the Traffic Division. Proposition H simply extends hazard-pay to the 17 or so officers on the equally perilous motorbike detail.

The amount of money involved is small—only $178 a month for each officer. Proposition H is small recognition of the dangers the police daily face in the line of duty. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Military & Social Spending Initiative

PROPOSITION I

(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco does not have an official position on whether federal taxes should be used for certain kinds of defense spending.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I says the Board of Supervisors must inform the President and certain other federal officials that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether they want their tax dollars used for certain kinds of “excessive military expenditures”, as defined in the measure. Proposition I also says the City’s Chief Administrative Officer must publish an annual report on the amount of federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents, what portion of these taxes are used for military spending, and what portion are used for social or human needs. The Board of Supervisors would appoint a seven-member Citizens’ Advisory Committee to oversee the preparation of the report.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you think federal officials should be told that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending. You also want the City to publish an annual report on how federal tax dollars collected from San Francisco residents are spent.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t think taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending, and you don’t want the City to publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition relating to military and social expenditures had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The proponents of the petition had gathered 12,271 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 2. The proponents are officially listed as G.C. Barnes, L.J. Crowe, H.J. Hobi and R.A. Wall.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,304 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time but should not be substantial.”

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 75.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This initiative should be passed because it educates people about excessive military spending and sends a clear message to the Federal Government that people want a choice as to how their taxes are spent.

Homer Hobi  
Chairperson  
The Humanist Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why waste taxpayers’ money for a handful of misguided individuals?  
City government is mandated to govern local citizens affairs.

Martin Eng  
School Board Candidate

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE  
PROPOSITION I

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

Section 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following terms are defined:

(a) Excessive military expenditures: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is destined for research, development, and production of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons; research, development, and production of outer space laser-beam technology weapons (popularly known as “star-war” weapons); research, development, and production of chemical and biological warfare; military aid, both overt and covert, to undemocratic and/or repressive governments (governments that violate the basic human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948 by the United Nations).

(b) Social or human needs: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is used for education, housing, health and human services, public transportation, and the arts.

(c) San Francisco taxpayer: any individual who pays federal taxes and who reports his or her principal place of residence within the San Francisco city limits;

and any corporation who is considered by the Internal Revenue Service as residing in San Francisco.

Section 2. The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco shall notify the President of the United States, the Vice-President, all members of the President’s Cabinet, and all members of Congress: that it is the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on the Federal Government to ask all Federal taxpayers, at the time they report their federal taxes, whether they wish that any part of their tax contribution be used for excessive military expenditures. This policy shall also be published for the people of San Francisco in major city newspapers.

Section 3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall be responsible for the publication of an annual report citing the amount of all federal tax monies collected from San Francisco taxpayers. This annual report shall include the following amounts:

(a) total federal tax revenues contributed by all San Francisco taxpayers;

(b) portion of the revenues in 3(a) budgeted for any type of military expenditures;

(c) portion of revenues in 3(a) budgeted for excessive military expenditures;

(d) portion of revenues in 3(a) budgeted for social or human needs;

(e) average individual tax contribution;

(f) average individual tax contribution allocated to (1) excessive military expenditures and (2) social needs.

The Board of Supervisors shall appoint a Citizen’s Advisory Committee every year to oversee the preparation of the report and to ensure that its findings are accurate and impartial. The Citizen’s Advisory Committee shall consist of seven members, at least three of whom shall be volunteers from renowned Peace organizations in San Francisco.

The report shall use the most current figures available from the federal government at the time of publication, citing the sources for the computations. If the necessary tax and budgetary breakdowns for San Francisco were not available, the report shall base itself upon tax revenue and budgetary figures for the entire nation (or subdivision thereof) and produce accurate extrapolations.

The Chief Administrative Officer shall publish the report in the two newspapers of largest circulation in San Francisco, no earlier than 14 days before but no later than the normal deadline for the filing of federal income taxes for individuals.
South African Investment Policy

PROPOSITION J

(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?

YES 283

NO 284

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco has no policy about the investment of pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco and its agencies not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa. This would be the official policy until Black people are given full political and civil rights by the government of South Africa.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want it to be the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City and County of San Francisco to have an official policy against investing pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition on South African investment policy had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Julianne Malveaux, the official proponent of the petition drive, had gathered 11,404 signatures which she turned in to the Registrar on August 8.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,520 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, investment income may be affected in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount.”

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We support removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa because we believe the city of San Francisco should not support the reprehensible institution of apartheid. Non-whites in South Africa are denied freedom of association, freedom of mobility, freedom of speech, and voting rights. San Franciscans support this inequality when city pension funds are invested in companies that do business with South Africa.

This investment is also a very risky investment since any civil unrest in South Africa may lower the value of the investment. Other investment possibilities will equal or exceed current yields on the pension portfolio.

We support this initiative because we support equal rights for all, and because we believe in prudent investment of city pension funds.

San Franciscans for Responsible Investments
Julianne Malveaux, Chair
Essie Mormen, Co-Chair
Henry Clark, Co-Chair
Arlo Hale Smith, Treasurer

Hon. Sala Burton
Hon. Harry Britt
Hon. Doris Ward
Hon. Richard Hongisto
Hon. Nancy Walker
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Louis Hopp Lee
Kim Corsaro
Roberto Hernandez
Bruce St. Cyr
Tim Lennon
Beatrice Eisman
Joan Apodaca
Wardell Jackson
Susan Englander
Henry Der
Sue Hestor
Ida Strickland
Bradford Paul
Daniel Moses
National Labor Relations
Board Union Local 20

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

By supporting Proposition J, San Franciscans join citizens from fourteen other cities, including Washington, D.C., Boston, and Berkeley, in removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa. Our support strikes a blow against the apartheid policy that has denied Black and non-white people equal rights in South Africa.

Removing pension funds from South Africa makes good economic sense. International investment advisors recommend against such investment because of the frailty of the South African political situation. Significantly, none of the cities that have divested funds from South Africa have had lower earnings since divestment.

It is both morally just and fiscally sound to vote YES for Proposition J!

Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Economics
S.F. State University
Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud that we were the first state in the nation to vote to sell from our public pension fund portfolio all investments in firms doing business in South Africa. Since the passage of this landmark legislation, it has been our experience that divestiture makes not only a strong moral statement against apartheid, but divestiture has proven to have had no negative impact on our pension earnings.

I urge San Franciscans to give serious consideration to both the moral and the financial arguments as you consider divestiture as a policy of your great city.

Michael Dukakis
Governor, Massachusetts
Submitted by John Burke
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For over a decade individuals and institutional investors, including local and state governments, universities, foundations, churches, Taft-Hartley pension funds and health and welfare plans have refused to invest in, and divested from corporations and financial institutions economically supporting apartheid in South Africa.

They are investing and earning competitive returns in housing, small business, alternative energy, and other socially productive investments which create employment and prevent capital from being exported to South Africa.

It is fiduciarily irresponsible to risk beneficiaries' pension assets by investing in companies in South Africa.

Many trade and corporate risk analysts have recommended no investment exposure in South Africa. The Rockefeller Study Commission on U.S. policy toward Southern Africa, recently recommended no new corporate investments in that white, minority ruled country.

Vote to create jobs, housing and small business in your community, not apartheid in South Africa. Vote YES on Proposition J.

John Harrington, President
Working Assets Money Fund

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

“For the sake of the children of all South Africans, black and white, for God’s sake, for the sake of world peace, the international community must take action, it must exert pressure on South Africa—political pressure, diplomatic pressure and above all, economic pressure.” (Bishop Desmond Tutu, General Secretary-South African Council of Churches, 1981)

The apartheid system continues because of Western support. The South African Council of Churches has said “foreign investors must know they are investing to buttress one of the most vicious systems since Nazism.” As members of the international religious community, we can no longer let others make decisions which contradict all that we believe in. We urge San Franciscans to vote yes on Proposition J as a specific, responsible way to express their moral rejection of apartheid.

I support Proposition J and encourage a statewide effort to remove pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON “J”

STATEMENT BY UNION OFFICIALS

The United Nations General Assembly declared South African apartheid “a crime against humanity”; and that investment in South Africa “encourages the apartheid policies of that country”.

Representatives of several hundred million unionists, meeting under UN-International Labour Organization auspices, called for the elimination of stocks of companies investing in South Africa, from pension funds.

As unionists and human rights advocates we support this measure.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Rev. Cecil Williams
Dr. Thomas Ambrogi
Dr. Norman Leach
Rev. Glenda Hope
Rev. Jean Richardson
Rev. Robert Cromey
Rev. Stanley Stefancic
Rev. James Clairot
Rev. Pamela White
First Congregational Church
Rev. Kenneth Westray
Rev. Preliono Walker
Rev. Charles Lewis
Rev. Matthew Fong
Rev. Donald Stuart
Rev. Lloyd Wake

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Lia Belli
Democratic Candidate,
State Senate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Committee for International Support of Trade Union Rights
Charles Lamb
Anthony L. Ramos
Jack Goldberg
Curtis Mc Clain
Frank Souza
Stanley M. Smith
Mary Anne Petersen
Timothy J. Twomey
Walter L. Johnson
Jack Henning
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

To protect American interests and to halt the spread of Communist influence into South Africa, responsible action is needed to end legally-required racial segregation and to reasonably extend voting rights.

Proposition J is an important step towards a moderate solution of the South African problem.

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman

Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee

Todd Roust
Republican State Senate Nominee

Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

WARNING TO VOTERS

Disregard any self-serving statements by Peter Ashe, Meta Stanley, and their controversial Retirement Board in connection with Proposition J.

The Retirement Board has done more than just aid South Africa by its investment policies.

The Retirement Board has made serious investment errors, produced poor investment yields, and run up market value investment portfolio losses of $160,852,320 (as of 3/30/84) with Prudential-Bache.

Mike Garza
Robert Silvestri
Max Woods

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Rainbow Coalition and all members, support this initiative. Stop investments of San Francisco pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. Support Human Rights. People have a right to know that their pension funds are being used to support a racist, repressive, apartheid system, that denies basic human and civil rights to 24 million Africans. We have a right to know that a Black man can be detained in the South African penal system for as long as two years, for not having identification. That Black people there are denied the right to vote, buy or sell land, and the right to live or work where they choose. Support Human Rights. Vote in favor of prop. J.

Gale White
African American of the Rainbow
Rev. Howard Gloyd
Northern California Chairman
The Rainbow Coalition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco CISPES supports the removal of city pension fund investments from firms that profit from apartheid.

The government of South Africa, like the government of El Salvador, denies its people the most basic human rights: freedom from arbitrary arrest and torture; freedom of speech and association; and the right to a decent standard of living.

In 1983, San Franciscans said no to military aid to El Salvador. In 1984, let us say no to investments in South Africa.

San Francisco Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Apartheid continues to be used to enslave black working people in South Africa. International labor has consistently condemned apartheid, and agrees that disinvestment from South Africa is an effective means of pressure.

David Aroner, Executive Director
SEIU Local 535

Timothy Twomey, Secretary-Treasurer
Hospital and Institutional Workers
Local 250

Paul Varacalli, Executive Director
United Public Employees Local 390/400
SEIU

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For the Black majority, apartheid in South Africa means no right to vote, unionize or speak out. Those who resist are murdered, tortured and imprisoned. Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, has been imprisoned for over twenty years. Apartheid is fascism!

U.S. companies investing in South Africa profit from low wages paid to Black workers, and play a key role in keeping apartheid alive. Say NO to apartheid and racism—Vote YES on Prop J.

Henry Clark, Candidate for
Congress, Fifth Congressional District

Gloria La Riva
All-Peoples' Congress

Johnnie Stevens
Southern Africa Freedom Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Joint Council of the Service Employees International Union has unanimously endorsed this proposal. The Union took this action because of the economic oppression of citizens by the South African Government, because of the termination of trade union rights and the arrest of union leaders, and because of the moral “Crime against humanity” of Apartheid.

Timothy J. Twomey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

South African apartheid is condemned the world over. Even the Reagan Administration expresses opposition.

Yet South Africa and apartheid continue to flourish, subjecting all non-whites to the vilest humiliations, discrimination, and exploitation.

San Francisco supports apartheid through our investment of municipal pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. By their very presence there, these companies maintain the status quo. Otherwise, the ruling white minority would not welcome these investments! We allow apartheid to continue, despite all the rhetoric we direct at South Africa.

San Franciscans can make responsible investments elsewhere. Voting YES on J, we join other cities in cutting the taproot—foreign finance—which allows the horrors of South Africa to go on, and on, and on . . . . End it! Vote YES, against apartheid!

Executive Committee
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY A PROPOSITION OF ISSUING REVENUE BONDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.312 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $104,000,000 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, FINANCING, IMPROVING AND DEVELOPING WATER DEPARTMENT FACILITIES; AND CONSOLIDATING SAID SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 1984.

WHEREAS, Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the Board of Supervisors in each instance, the Public Utilities Commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities of the San Francisco Water Department subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of Charter Section 7.300, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco by resolution No. 84-0363 adopted July 24, 1984, pursuant to said Section 7.312, has recommended that the Board of Supervisors, by resolution, submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held for that purpose on November 6, 1984, the proposition of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, as it read on June 5, 1984, and Charter Section 7.312 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission in said resolution 84-0363;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

Section 1. A special revenue bond election is hereby ordered and will be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 6, 1984, at which election there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County the proposition of issuing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of providing funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, all as set forth in the following proposition:

Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds

Shall the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to Charter Section 7.312 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing additions, betterments and improvements to the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system, including filtration and treatment works and plants, reservoirs and other water supply, storage and distribution facilities, lands and equipment necessary or convenient for the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system?

Section 2. Said revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 (herein called the "Bonds") are proposed to be issued to finance improvements to an enterprise (herein called the "Enterprise") which is herein defined to be the City and County of San Francisco municipal water supply, storage and distribution systems of the San Francisco Water Department, including all of the presently existing municipal water system of the City and County and all additions, betterments, extensions and improvements thereto. Said existing water system and the proposed improvements thereto shall constitute a single, unified integrated enterprise, and the revenues therefrom shall be pledged to the payment of the bonds. It is hereby found and determined that said municipal water system is necessary to enable the City and County to exercise its municipal powers and functions, namely, to furnish sufficient water for any present or future beneficial use of the City and County.

(a) The purpose for which the Bonds are proposed to be issued is to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, including any expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith.

(b) The estimated costs of the acquisition, construction, financing, improvement and development is $104,000,000. Said estimated cost includes all costs and expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, engineering, inspection, legal and fiscal agents' fees, cost of the revenue bond election and of the issuance of the Bonds, bond reserve funds, and working capital and bond interest estimated to accrue during the construction period and for a period of not to exceed 12 months after completion of construction.

(c) The maximum principal amount of the Bonds proposed to be issued is $104,000,000.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at said special revenue bond election the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution, and designates and refers to said proposition in the form of ballot hereinafter prescribed for use at said election.

(a) Said special revenue bond election shall be held and conducted, and the votes thereafter canvassed and the returns thereof made, and the result thereof ascertained and determined as herein provided; and in all particulars not described by this resolution, said special election shall be held and the votes canvassed pursuant to law for general municipal elections in the City and County and pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 52 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) All persons qualified to vote at municipal elections in the City and County upon the date of the election herein provided for shall be qualified to vote upon the proposition submitted at said special revenue bond election.

(c) Said special revenue bond election is hereby consolidated with the general municipal election to be held in the City and County on November 6, 1984, pursuant to the Charter of the City and County. The precincts, polling places and officers of election for said special revenue bond election shall be the same as those established.
and designated for said general municipal election. Reference is hereby made to the notice of election by the Registrar of Voters setting forth the precincts, polling places and officers of election for said general municipal election, to be published on or about October 15, 1984 for more particular description of said precincts, polling places and officers of election.

(d) The ballot used at said general municipal election and said special revenue bond election hereby consolidated with shall have printed thereon, in addition to all other matters required by law, the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution.

(e) Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word “YES” on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word “NO” on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballots are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word “YES” to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word “NO” to the right of said proposition.

If and to the extent that voting machines are used at said special revenue bond election such machines shall be so arranged

that any qualified voter may vote for said proposition by pulling down a lever over the word “YES” under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboards, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for said proposition, and may vote against it by pulling down a lever over the word “NO” under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboards, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote against said proposition. The statement of said proposition appearing on cardboards, paper or other material used in voting machines shall read substantially as follows:

$104,000,000 San Francisco Water Department Revenue Bonds.

Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with law.

Section 4. If the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution shall be authorized by the qualified voters of the City and County by the votes of a majority of all the voters voting on said proposition, the Bonds may be issued and sold for the purpose set forth in Section 2 of this resolution.

The Bonds are to be revenue bonds, payable exclusively from the revenues of the Enterprise and such other funds from any source as may be legally available for such purpose and may be used by the City and County for such purpose without incurring indebtedness. The Bonds are not to be secured by the taxing power of the City and County, and shall be issued under Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County. The principal of and interest on the Bonds and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof shall not constitute a debt of the City and County, nor a legal or equitable pledge, charge, lien or encumbrance upon any of its property, or upon any of its income, receipts or revenues except the revenues of the Enterprise and other funds that may be legally applied, pledged or otherwise made available to their payment. The Bonds, if authorized, shall be special obligations of the Public Utilities Commission and shall be secured by a pledge and shall be a charge upon, and shall be payable, as to the principal thereof, interest thereon, and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof, solely from and secured by a lien upon the revenues of the Enterprise and such funds as may be described in the resolution authorizing the issuance of the Bonds.

The Bonds shall not constitute or evidence indebtedness of the City and County but shall constitute and evidence only an indebtedness of the Public Utilities Commission payable solely out of revenues received by the Public Utilities Commission from San Francisco Water Department facilities operated or controlled by it. The Bonds shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in section 6.401 of the Charter.

Section 5. This resolution shall be printed in the voters' pamphlet and mailed to each registered voter pursuant to Section 9.105 of the Charter of the City and County.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C, Continued from page 61

bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, a deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director.

The director of public works shall designate a deputy or other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plans and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors. All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

The department of public works shall have powers and duties relating to street traffic, subject to the laws relating thereto, as follows:

(a) to cooperate with and assist the police department in the promotion of
traffic safety education;
(b) to receive, study and give prompt attention to complaints relating to street design or traffic devices or the absence thereof;
(c) to collect, compile, analyze and interpret traffic and parking data and to analyze and interpret traffic accident information;
(d) to engage in traffic research and traffic planning; and
(e) to cooperate for the best performance of these functions with any department and agency of the city and county and the state as may be necessary.

The department shall submit to the traffic bureau of the police department, for its review and recommendation, all proposed plans relating to street traffic control devices; provided, however, that the bureau may waive submission and review of plans of particular devices designated by it. Failure of the said traffic bureau to submit to the department its recommendation on any proposed plan within fifteen (15) days after receipt shall be considered an automatic approval of said traffic bureau. The department shall not, with respect to any traffic control devices, implement such plan until the recommendation of the traffic bureau has been reviewed or until the fifteen (15) day period has elapsed.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county upon paying a fair compensation for such connection and use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendation of the chief of the department.

Department of Public Health, which shall be administered by a director of health, who shall be a regularly licensed physician or surgeon in the State of California, with not less than 10 years' practice in his profession immediately preceding his appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician or surgeon requirement may be waived by the board of supervisors. He shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The chief administrative officer shall have power to appoint and to remove an assistant director of public health for hospital services, who shall be responsible for the administrative and business management of the institutions of the department of public health, including, but not limited to, the San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Home, Hessieier Health Home, and the Emergency Hospital Service, and who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of assistant director of public health for hospital services shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the institutions of the department of public health.

The director of public health shall have power to appoint and remove an administrator of San Francisco General Hospital who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of administrator shall be held only by a physician or hospital administrator who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the San Francisco General Hospital.

Health Advisory Board. There is hereby created a health advisory board of seven members, three of whom shall be physicians and one dentist, all regularly certificated. Members of the board shall serve without compensation. They shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer for terms of four years; provided, however, that those first appointed shall classify themselves by lot so that the term of one physician and one lay member shall expire in 1935, 1937 and 1939, respectively, and the term of one member in 1936.

Such board shall consider and report upon problems and matters under the jurisdiction of the department of public health and shall consult, advise with and make recommendations to the director of health relative to the functions and affairs of the department. The recommendations of such board shall be made in writing to the director of health and to the chief administrative officer.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of scaler of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center.

If in the election of June 5, 1960 November 6, 1964 two or more propositions amending section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

PART TWENTY-ONE: HEALTH COMMISSION

3.695 Composition of Department; Commission

The public health department shall consist of a health commission, a director of public health and such employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter. The department shall be under the management of a health commission consisting of seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor. Said commission shall have less than a majority of direct providers of health care. Direct providers of health care shall mean all
health professionals and others whose "primary current activity" is the provision of patient care or the administration of facilities or institutions which provide patient care. The term of each member of the commission shall be four years, commencing at twelve o'clock, noon, on the 15th day of January in the year 1985; provided, that the respective terms of office of those first appointed shall be as follows: two for four years, two for three years, two for two years, and one for one year. Vacancies occurring on said commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of each of said members shall be filled by the mayor. No commissioner may serve more than two consecutive terms or a total of eight years.

The compensation of each commissioner shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month. The commissioners shall annually elect one of their members president. They shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the governance of the commission.

3.696 Director of Public Health; Other Executives

The health commission shall appoint a director of public health who shall serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The director of public health shall be a regularly licensed physician in the State of California, with not less than five years' experience in public health administration immediately preceding his or her appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician requirement may be waived by the health commission. The director of public health shall be the chief executive of the commission and shall, subject to the approval of the commission, manage all operations under its jurisdiction. The director shall have power to appoint and remove a deputy director for operations, a deputy director for community health programs, an administrator for San Francisco General Hospital and an administrator for Laguna Honda Hospital. The administrators of San Francisco General Hospital and of Laguna Honda Hospital shall have power to appoint and remove associate administrators to the extent such positions are created by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

These positions shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter and shall be held by persons who possess the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the divisions and institutions of the department. However, any person who has civil service status in any of the above positions on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have such status under the civil service provisions of this charter. All positions in the department legally authorized shall be continued and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.697 Powers and Duties

The health commission shall manage and control the city and county hospitals, emergency medical services, and all matters pertaining to the preservation, promotion, and protection of the lives, health and mental health of the inhabitants of the city and county, except where this charter specifically grants that power to another department. It may also determine the nature and character of public health nuisances and provide for their abatement.

The commission shall inspect the sanitary conditions of the municipal institutions of the city and county, including jails and all public buildings; of the disposition of the dead; of the disposition of garbage, offal and offensive substances.

The commission shall be a policy-making and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in section 3,500 of this charter. The commission shall have the power to establish and make appointments to advisory committees as it shall deem necessary.

8.107 Suspension and Removal

Any elective officer, and any member of the civil service commission, health commission, or public utilities commission or school board may be suspended by the mayor and removed by the board of supervisors for official misconduct, and the mayor shall appoint a qualified person to discharge the duties of the office during the period of suspension. On such suspension, the mayor shall immediately notify the supervisors thereof in writing and the cause therefor, and shall present written charges against such suspended officer to the board of supervisors at or prior to its next regular meeting following such suspension, and shall immediately furnish copy of same to such officer, who shall have the right to appear with counsel before the board in his defense. Hearing by the supervisors shall be held not less than five days after the filing of written charges. If the charges are deemed to be sustained by not less that a three-fourths vote of all members of the board, the suspended officer shall be removed from office; if not so sustained, or if not acted on by the board of supervisors within thirty (30) days after the filing of written charges, the suspended officer shall thereby be reinstated.

The mayor must immediately remove from office any elective official convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, and failure of the mayor so to act shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part.

Any appointee of the mayor, exclusive of civil service, health, recreation and park, and public utilities commissioners, and members of the school board, may be removed by the mayor. Any nominee or appointee of the mayor whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, except the chief administrative officer and the controller, as in this charter otherwise provided, may be removed by a majority of such board and with the concurrence of the mayor. In each case, written notice shall be given or transmitted to such appointee of such removal, the date of effectiveness thereof, and the reasons therefor, a copy of which notice shall be printed at length in the journal of proceedings of the board of supervisors, together with such reply in writing as such official may make. Any appointee of the mayor or the board of supervisors guilty of official misconduct or convicted of crime involving moral turpitude must be removed by the mayor or the board of supervisors, as the case may be, and failure of the mayor or any supervisor to take such action shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F — Continued from page 69

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

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

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

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

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

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

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

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

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

B (b) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection G (g) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection F (f) of this section shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this subsection B (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this subsection B (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said subsection F (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of sixty years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty years, computed under subsection G (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection G (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¹/₂</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed seventy-five percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection C (c) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within thirty 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of sixty-five 65 years may elect, without right to revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month upon retirement after thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty years, and provided further that as to any member within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for
each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

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

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

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

(1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection E (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

F (f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system,
provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least ten years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000), he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, ninety 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus one and two-thirds (1 2/3) percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

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

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

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7 1/2) percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection G (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual account of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1946, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

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

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision § (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of thirty 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provision of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

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

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

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

L (l) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections B (b), e (c), F (f) and J (j) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

M (m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973 shall be effective July 1, 1982.

The amendment of Section 8.584-5 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973 shall be effective July 1, 1982.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.584-5 Death Benefit

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

(a) If no benefit is payable under Subsection B (b) of this section:

(1) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(2) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(b) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Section 8.584-2, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subsection (b), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subsection (b) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subsection (a) of this section, the amount of said benefit payable under Subsection (a) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subsection (b) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

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

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

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in this Subsection (a) of this section in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this section, for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so
made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

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

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

Upon the death of a member after retirement, an allowance, in addition to the death benefit provided in the immediately preceding paragraph, shall be paid to his surviving spouse, until such surviving spouse’s death or remarriage, equal to one-half of his retirement allowance as it was prior to optional modification and prior to reduction as provided in subsection (a) of Section 8.514 of this charter, but exclusive of the part of such allowance which was provided by additional contributions. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this paragraph to a surviving spouse unless such surviving spouse was married to said member at least one year prior to his retirement. If such retired person leaves no such surviving spouse, or if such surviving spouse should die or remarry before every child of such deceased retired person attains the age of 18 eighteen years, the allowance which such surviving spouse would have received had he or she lived and not remarried shall be paid to retired person’s child or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

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

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 twelve 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 one-year twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve 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 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four 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 thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated in his to the position without prejudice, and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of his the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which he that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee’s eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotive classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall 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.

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

8.05 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments.

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the Board of Supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its
duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in Section 3.531 of this Charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with
be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter. For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firemen" "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective rate of this section

by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 3.861 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be the same as above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be the same as above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section.

The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest rate of cost of living increase in any city in the state.

Further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and shall it be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uni-
formed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no unformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT VOTING

You can vote for any candidate, regardless of party. This is a General Election and you can vote for any candidate on your ballot. Political party restrictions only apply at Primary Elections (in June).

Do not vote for more than the authorized number of candidates or none of your votes for that contest will be counted. Most candidate contests specify "Vote for one" but you can vote for up to six supervisors and up to four School and College Board members. If you make a mistake and vote for more than six candidates for supervisor you can get a replacement ballot.

If you move, you must re-register. The most common complaint we get on election day is that someone can't vote because they have moved and not re-registered. If you have moved, your name will probably not be on the rolls anymore and even if it is, it is not legal to vote using your old polling place (except in certain rare circumstances). Next time you move, don't leave your vote behind; remember to re-register.

You don't have to be sick or out-of-town to get an absentee ballot. Any voter can request an absentee ballot for any reason, or for no reason. To become a "permanent" absentee voter you must be disabled but ordinary absentee voters do not have to have a reason.

Your registration will not necessarily be cancelled if you don't vote but chances of that happening will increase if you don't vote. After the election, we will send a postcard confirming the address of all nonvoters. If the Post Office or the current resident says you don't live there anymore, your registration will be cancelled. No one is automatically cancelled for not voting at any election.

It is not necessary to re-register before each election. Your registration is permanent and will remain in effect until you move, die or are convicted of a felony.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

How to Use the Votomatic

STEP 1

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

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del “Votomatic.”

第一步

拔出程式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 coincidan con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步

請確記選票插入時，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 perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步

請把帶錐之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

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，有空白格處留為投票人應用。
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name _____________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________ Apt. # ______

Telephone No. (required) ________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes [ ] no [ ]

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) ______________________________

Signature _______________________________________________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

Election Date

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:

Mailing address, if different from above
Dirección Postal (si es diferente)

Residence Address

Extra Application for Absentee Ballot

Since this page would have been blank anyway, we have used the space to reprint an extra copy of the absentee ballot application form.

Your "real" absentee ballot application appears as a postcard inserted into this book. We would prefer that you use the postcard form because it is easier to process and less likely to get lost.

If two persons in your household are requesting absentee ballots, you may put both postcard forms into an envelope in order to save postage.

The disabled may apply as permanent absentee voters by completing the little box at the bottom of the form. Disabilities that qualify for permanent absentee status include circulatory problems and mobility impairments as well as more severe disabilities.

If you have not yet received your absentee ballot, then you are probably not on our permanent absentee mailing list. The permanent absentee voters' ballots were mailed out the week of October 9th.
Application for absentee ballot appears on Page 48
Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊在第48頁
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PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORA LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escribe el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SÍ" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precincto y obtenga otra.

選民須知:

投票時所選擇的任何其他候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇您要投票的候選人打孔，但不要超過要選舉的限定人數。

選舉合資的非資格的候選人，請在非資格候選人選票信封所標的預定空位上標下該候選人所競選的職位和姓氏名稱。

選舉時請注意，請在選票上箭頭所指 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若有痕跡或被破壞，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯了，撕破或弄髒了，或撕裂了非資格候選人的選票信封，應把該選票退還給選舉處的監票員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
President and Vice President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. MONDALE</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALDINE A. FERRARO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BERGLAND</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES A. LEWIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB RICHARDS</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN KENNEDY SALAMAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMA WONG MAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

United States Representative
5th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA, Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK, Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENADOR ESTATAL</td>
<td>State Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON MARKS, Republican</td>
<td>58 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator Senador Estatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS, Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>60 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Organizer Organizador Socialista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIA BELL, Democratic</td>
<td>62 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Negotiator/Conservationist 貿易談判員/環境保護者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negociador de Comercio/Aboga Por La Conservación</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK PICKENS, Libertarian</td>
<td>64 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owner Propietario de Pequeños Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</td>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI, Republican</td>
<td>71 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Central Committeeman Miembro, Comité Central del Condado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic</td>
<td>73 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly Miembro de la Asamblea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**NOTE:** 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, Board of Supervisors</th>
<th>市参議員</th>
<th>选择最多六人</th>
<th>Vote for No More than Six</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOUISE RENNE</strong></td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors 市参議員</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULIAN LAGOS</strong></td>
<td>Political Scientist / Educator 政治学者／教育家</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULIANNE MALVEAUX</strong></td>
<td>Economics Professor / Writer 經済学教授／作家</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOHN L. MOLINARI</strong></td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors 市参議員</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES</strong></td>
<td>Banker 銀行家</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS</strong></td>
<td>Executive 執行人</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIANA COLEMAN</strong></td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant 社会主義労働者</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RUBY T. JIMENEZ</strong></td>
<td>Directory Sales Representative 姓氏地址電話推销量</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANDREW “DADDY ANDY” JONES</strong></td>
<td>SFCC Student 市立大学学生</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HARRY BRITT</strong></td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors 市参議員</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RICHARD BRADLEY</strong></td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant 社会主義労働者</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RANDALL BRONNER</strong></td>
<td>Artist, Musician 音楽家</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JONATHAN BULKLEY</strong></td>
<td>Architect / Neighborhood Planner 建築家／街坊設計師</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROGER BOSCHETTI</strong></td>
<td>T.V. Ethnic Producer 電視少數民族製作人</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>(<a href="#">link</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPORTANT:**
- There are two (2) pages of candidates for Supervisor.
- (29 candidates, vote for 6)

(Contest Continued on Next Page) (Continua en la siguiente página)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Position/Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>KEVIN STARR</td>
<td>Businessman, Communicator, Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de Negocios, Comunicador, Profesor</td>
<td>商人，信息員，教授</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>CAROL RUTH SILVER</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
<td>現任市議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>DAVID C. SMITH</td>
<td>Administrator, Service Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escritor, Movimiento Socialista</td>
<td>服務機構行政管理員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>JOHN E. WAHL</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td>律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Writer, Socialist Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escritor, Movimiento Socialista</td>
<td>作家，社會主義活動家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Community Service Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado de Servicio Publico</td>
<td>社區服務律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrador de Servicios de Salud</td>
<td>衛生行政人員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>ROBERT D. INGRAHAM</td>
<td>Political Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultor Politico</td>
<td>政治顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>ELEANOR M. DAVIS</td>
<td>Hi-Tech Business Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mujer de Negocios / Campo Tecnológico</td>
<td>高級工藝女商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td>Management Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultor Administrativo</td>
<td>行政管理顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>WILLIE B. KENNEDY</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>市議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Musico</td>
<td>音樂家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP</td>
<td>Attorney / Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado / Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>律師／市議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>JOHN SALEH ABDULLA</td>
<td>Real Estate Salesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vendedor de Bienes y Raices</td>
<td>實業推銷員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>SUZANNE ALBERTO</td>
<td>Administrative Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretaria Administrativa</td>
<td>行政秘書</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE**

29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DICK CERBATOS</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBBY DENEBEIM</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE DYKSTRA</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE S. HOPP</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Member, Community College Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE F. PEHARGOU</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOS C. BROWN</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo 現任社區大學董事</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo 現任社區大學董事</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM WOLFRED</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo 現任社區大學董事</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST “CHUCK” AYALA</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo 現任社區大學董事</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN GOODMAN</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Teacher/Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>County Central Committeeman 縣中央委員</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Member, Board of Directors, BART District 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARON A. VIEIRA</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Computer Technician 電腦技術員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RODNEY JOHNSON</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Attorney Abogado 律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN H. KIRKWOOD</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>BART Director Director de BART 獨區捷運系統董事</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Clean Water Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $325,000,000 to provide funds for water pollution control, water conservation, and water reclamation projects and activities.</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>State School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance Cleanup Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for hazardous substance cleanup.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $75,000,000 to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Veterans Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $650,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Senior Center Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $50,000,000 to provide funds for senior centers.</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Property Taxation. Fire Protection Systems Exclusion. Empowers Legislature to exclude from property tax reassessment certain newly constructed fire protection improvements. Fiscal Impact: If implemented, estimated local government property tax revenue losses of less than $5 million annually, state government increases in costs to compensate for local school district property tax loss, and state government increases in income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NÚMERO</td>
<td>VOTO</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA LIMPIA DE 1984**

Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $325,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para control de la contaminación del agua, conservación del agua y para proyectos y actividades de recuperación del agua.

**LEY ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE ESCUELAS DE 1984**

Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para financiar el desarrollo de capital para la construcción o mejoría de las escuelas públicas.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA LIMPIEZA DE SUBSTANCIAS PELIGROSAS**

Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para limpiar del medio las sustancias peligrosas.

**LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA POTABLE SALUBRE DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984**

Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $75,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la mejora de los sistemas de agua domésticos para cumplir con las normas mínimas de agua potable.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1984**

Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $650,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA CENTROS PARA PERSONAS DE EDAD MAYOR DE 1984**

Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $50,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para centros para personas de edad mayor.

**FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE LOS SISTEMAS DE PROTECCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS**

Obrar poder a la Legislatura para excluir del recaudación del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas mejoras recientemente construidas para protección contra incendios. Impacto fiscal: De ser llevada a cabo, pérdidas en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad para los gobiernos locales calculadas en menos de $5 millones anuales, además aumentos en los gastos del gobierno estatal para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida en impuestos a la propiedad, y aumentos para el gobierno estatal en los gastos provenientes del impuesto a la renta debido a menores deducciones en los impuestos a la propiedad.

**CORTES SUPREMA. TRANSFERENCIA DE CAUSAS. REVISIÓN DE DECISIONES**

Modifica las disposiciones constitucionales en vigencia en cuanto al traspaso de causas y la revisión de decisiones. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto significativo.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT. DISABLED PERSON. Authorizes Legislature to postpone</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>property tax payments on owner occupied principal residence by disabled person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal Impact: State expenditures estimated to be less than $2 million annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which would be recovered, with interest, when the homes are sold.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. HISTORIC STRUCTURE EXCLUSION. Excludes from property tax</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reassessment certain new construction on owner occupied principal residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>historic structures. Fiscal Impact: Local governments property tax revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>loss of less than $100,000 annually. State government expenditure of about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32% of this to compensate local school districts for property tax revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>losses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>(Proposition 35 has been withdrawn from the ballot)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>TAXATION. Amends Proposition 13 adding restrictions on real property tax</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taxation, new tax measures, and charging fees. Provides specified tax refunds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal Impact: State revenues reduced at least $100 million, net, over first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two-year period. State costs increased up to $750 million over first two-year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>period and by about $150 million annually in subsequent years to replace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>revenue losses to schools. Local agencies other than schools property tax and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other revenue losses of about $2.8 billion, net, over first two-year period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and of about $1.1 billion annually in subsequent years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>STATE LOTTERY. Establishes state-operated lottery. Revenue use: prizes, 50%;</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expenses, not more than 16%; public education, at least 34%. Fiscal Impact:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cannot be predicted with certainty. Estimated yield for public education would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be about $500 million annually, with less the first two years. Estimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>division: K-12, 80%; Community Colleges, 13%; California State University,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%; University of California, 2%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>VOTING MATERIALS. ENGLISH ONLY. Requires Governor urge federal officials</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>amend law so that voting materials be printed in English only. Fiscal Impact:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insignificant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cuadro 1: CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIÓN GENERAL, 6 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1984

---

**33**

POSTERGACIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. PERSONAS INHABILITADAS. Autoriza a la Legislatura a posponer los pagos del impuesto a la propiedad sobre una residencia principal ocupada por su dueño quien sea una persona inhabilitada. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales calculados en menos de tres años, anuales los cuales serían recuperados, con intereses, cuando las residencias sean vendidas.

---

**34**

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE ESTRUCTURA HISTÓRICA. Excluye del recaudo del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas construcciones o trabajos nuevos ejecutados en residencias que son estructuras históricas ocupadas por sus dueños como el principal lugar de residencia. Impacto fiscal: Pérdidas para los gobiernos locales en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad de menos de $100,000 anuales. Ayuda gubernamental estatal alrededor del 32% de esta suma para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida de ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad.

---

**35**

La Proposición número 35 no será usada en esta elección.

---

**36**

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. Enmienda la Proposición 13 añadiendo restricciones en la fijación de impuestos a la propiedad inmueble, nuevas medidas de impuestos y honorarios a cobrar. Dispone reembolsos especificados de impuestos. Impacto fiscal: Reducción en los ingresos estatales en por lo menos $100 millones netos, durante el primer período de dos años y en unos $150 millones anuales en años subsecuentes para reemplazar la pérdida de ingresos por las escuelas. Pérdidas para otras agencias locales, además de para las escuelas, del impuesto a la propiedad y otras pérdidas de ingresos de alrededor de $2.8 mil millones netos, durante el primer período de dos años y de alrededor de $1.1 mil millones anualmente en años subsecuentes.

---

**37**

LOTERÍA ESTATAL. Establece una lotería operada por el estado. Uso de los ingresos: premios, el 50%; gastos, no más del 16%; educación pública, por lo menos el 34%. Impacto fiscal: No puede ser predicho con certeza. El rendimiento que se calcula para la educación pública será de alrededor de $300 millones anuales, siendo menor los dos primeros años. División que se calcula: jardín de infantes al 12° grado, el 80%; universidades de la comunidad, el 13%; Universidad Estatal de California, el 5%; Universidad de California, el 2%.

---

**38**

MATERIALES DE VOTACIÓN. INGLÉS SOLAMENTE. Requiere que el Gobernador urja a los funcionarios federales a que emiendan la ley para que los materiales para votación sean impresos en inglés solamente. Impacto fiscal: Insignificante.

---

Nota: La información anterior se basa en un resumen naturalizado del documento original. Es posible que no capture todos los detalles del texto original.
**REAPPORTIONMENT.** Provides reapportioning Senate, Assembly, Congressional, Equalization districts for 1986 and subsequent elections by new commission composed of former justices. Fiscal Impact: Commission costs of up to $3.5 million before 1986 election. Costs of $10,000 to $20,000 each to relocate an unknown number of district legislative offices. County costs of about $500,000 for 1986 election materials. County savings of about $300,000 in 1986 for printing costs, and $200,000 every two years thereafter. Future reapportionments will probably cost less than under existing law. 

**CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.** Limits contributors and contributions to elective state office candidates. Opposition candidate's personal expenditures matched by limited public funding. Fiscal Impact: Reduce state revenues by about $100,000 each fiscal year and increase state expenditures by approximately up to $1,650,000 each fiscal year. 

**PUBLIC AID, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.** Creates Public Assistance Commission. Limits benefit expenditures to national average plus 10%. Legislative amendments permitted. Fiscal Impact: Net effect would be combined state and county expenditure reduction beginning July 1, 1986. Size of reduction and impact at different levels of government impossible to determine. Substantial reductions under specified programs would be partially offset to an unknown extent by increased costs under other programs and reduced tax revenues resulting from reduced federal expenditures within the state. Likely, state expenditures would be reduced and county expenditures increased. 

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCION GENERAL, 6 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986

REDISTRIBUCIÓN. Dispone redistribución para los distritos del Senado, Asamblea, Congreso y de la Junta de Revisión de Avalúos para 1986 y para las elecciones subsecuentes mediante nueva comisión compuesta de anteriores jueces. Impacto fiscal: Costos de la comisión de hasta $3,5 millones antes de la elección de 1986. Costos de $10,000 a $20,000 cada uno para reubicar un número desconocido de oficinas legislativas en los distritos. Costos del condado alrededor de $500,000 para materiales para la elección de 1986. Ahorros para el condado alrededor de $300,000 en 1986 por costos de impresión y $200,000 cada dos años de allí en adelante. Las redistribuciones futuras probablemente costarán menos que bajo la ley actual.

CONTRIBUCIONES PARA COMPAÑÍAS. Limita a los contribuyentes y a quienes aporten a cargos políticos electivos, igual que con fondos públicos limitados a dos terceras partes del costo del cargo. Impacto fiscal: Reduce los ingresos estatales en unos $100,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal y aumenta los gastos estatales en aproximadamente hasta $1,650,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal.

AYUDA PÚBLICA, PROGRAMAS DE ASISTENCIA MÉDICA. Crea Comisión de Asistencia Pública. Limita gastos de beneficio al promedio nacional más el 10%. Permite enmiendas legales. Impacto fiscal: el efecto neto sería la reducción de los gastos combinados del estado y condados comenzando el 1er. de julio de 1986. El tamaño de la reducción y su impacto en los diferentes niveles del gobierno es imposible determinarse en esta momento. Reducciones sustanciales bajo programas especificados serían parcialmente compensadas hasta un grado desconocido mediante el aumento de gastos bajo otros programas y por ingresos de impuestos reducidos que resulten de gastos federales reducidos dentro del estado. Es factible que los gastos estatales serían reducidos y que los gastos de condados aumentarían.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

A. Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión del Puerto a emitir $42,500,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la construcción y mejoras de las instalaciones portuarias?

B. Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir $104,000,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones para el Departamento de Aguas?

C. Deberá crearse una Comisión de Salud que consista de siete miembros nombrados por el Alcalde para dirigir y controlar los hospitales de la Ciudad y el Condado, y los demás servicios de salud del Condado, y para nombrar un Director de Salud Pública?
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?</td>
<td>YES 261 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 262 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?</td>
<td>YES 264 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 265 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?</td>
<td>YES 267 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 268 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?</td>
<td>YES 270 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 271 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?</td>
<td>YES 274 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 275 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?</td>
<td>YES 278 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 279 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and Black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?</td>
<td>YES 283 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 284 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:

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

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto 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 voto completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

D 第一步
请双手将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.

D 第二步
请记住將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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

D 第三步
请把選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入，打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

D 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，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Comittee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 9, 1984.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election, such as this one, you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot.

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

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature, Supervisors, B.A.R.T., College Governing Board and Board of Education.

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

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

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 6, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 6, 1984.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

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

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 25 through 41 because in June the numbers were 16 through 24.

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

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

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

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

BONDS—Contracts to borrow and repay money.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
RODNEY JOHNSON

My age is 35
My occupation is a lawyer
My education and qualifications are: I am an attorney for Stanford University. Each day I help make decisions on financial matters, lawsuits, personnel issues, and policy for Stanford, which has an operating budget greater than $500 million. This involves matters ranging from running a hospital, to building 1000 units of new housing for faculty and staff. Additionally, I studied transportation while in college.

The BART representative should work for transportation solutions for San Francisco, and not just for BART. Can you find a seat on the bus? A parking place? I not only will work to manage BART more efficiently but also for San Francisco to obtain its fair share of money and consideration from federal, state, and local agencies in solving these problems.

I know the responsibilities of a public official. Elected to the 1978 Charter Commission, I served as its secretary and was appointed by Governor Brown to the regional Coastal Commission. I have worked to improve my neighborhood as a member of the Board of Directors of the Richmond District Neighborhood Center and the S.F. Local Development Corporation.

My endorsers include Assemblyman Art Agnos, former Police Chief Tom Cahill, Supervisors Britt, Silver, and Walker, and former Supervisors Lau and Morrison.

RODNEY JOHNSON

JOHN H. KIRKWOOD

My age is 37
My occupation is BART Director/Incumbent
My education and qualifications are: 13 years experience in transit. Graduate: Lick-Wilmerding, Stanford University. Since my 1974 election to the BART Board, I have consistently pushed BART to improve and function more efficiently. BART has doubled the number of cars in service; increased access for handicapped people and bicyclists; increased on-time performance from 45% to 95%; stopped fare evasion; increased opportunities for minorities and women; kept per-mile costs down; given employees more flexible schedules; and drastically improved fire and safety procedures (BART has run 5 billion passenger miles without a single passenger fatality, the best record in the nation.)

I constantly review transit professional journals and the trade press. I spend countless hours analyzing budgets and operating plans to find errors and false assumptions. My ambition is to be the best possible BART Director, not to seek higher office. If you have questions, call me at 362-2939.

My supporters include: Dianne Feinstein, Mayor John Molinari, Supervisor Louise Renne, Supervisor Bill Maher, Supervisor Agnes I. Chan, Former Charter Commissioner Nancy Levin, President, Public Utilities Commission Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transportation Commissioner Eugene Garfinkle, BART Director Margaret Pryor, BART Director Arlo Smith, District Attorney Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker, California Assembly

JOHN H. KIRKWOOD

ARON VIEIRA

My age is 21
My occupation is Computer Technician
My education and qualifications are: As a founding member of The Community for Human Development in San Francisco, I am running for this office out of my deep concern for the Board’s undemocratic policies and suspicious behavior. Although all of us in District 9 pay for BART few of us are informed about the decisions and operations of the BART Board.

Meetings are not widely publicized. When was the last time you were informed about a BART meeting? In fact the BART Board exercises a monopoly over BART decision making by closing its doors to active citizen participation.

If elected, my first priority will be to Open Up the BART Board meetings to public scrutiny. All meetings will be held at times and places convenient to San Francisco voters.

Public Transportation should be by and for the people! Humanize the BART!!

Aron Vieira

Statements printed on this page are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
JOHN SALEH ABDULLA

My address is 2533 Folsom Street
My occupation is Licensed Real Estate Salesman
My age is 30

My qualifications for office are: I graduated at a local public high school. I also attended private business schools. I am presently a licensed real estate salesman.

Knowing the city’s acute housing and employment problems, I am deeply concerned of the these problems and would like to be in a position to find solutions to these problems. While I have no immediate solutions; if elected, I promise the people of San Francisco that I will devote all of my time to finding solutions to these problems by utilizing all resources available to public officials in solving these problems.

John Saleh Abdulla

The sponsors for John Saleh Abdulla are:
Saleh M. Abdulla, 155 Clipper St., Janitor
Sam Bachman, 238 Eddy St., Janitor
Richard F. Bourdon, 165 Clipper St., Mover
Peter Bury, 555 Post St., Musician
Freddie Cononica, 1419 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Alfred Catalin, 1459 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Bernard Fabins, 3609-8th St., Deputy Clerk
Robert Fulgham, 487 Joost St., Business Representative
Saleh M. Ghanem, 155 Clipper St., Maintenance
Stephen A. Halbe, 1202-23rd Ave., Musician
Jamal Jawad, 488 Ellis St., Business Owner
Zelma Ann Johnston, 755 O’Farrell St., Retired
Barbara D. Jones, 1421 South Van Ness Ave., Housewife
Alfred E. Kelly, 610 Polk St., Retired Union Official
Yaya S. Mohamed, 610 Eddy St., Maintenance
Brian Charles Percy, 333 Hyde St., Payroll clerk
Charles Ridgell, 347 Lexington St., Business Representative,
Janitors Union
James Roy Sellers, 375 O’Farrell St., Unemployed
Madeline Smith, 159 Clipper St., Housewife
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect

SUZANNE ALBERTO

My address is 25 Pinto Avenue
My occupation is Administrative Secretary
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I am a Hispanic-Filipina (English/Spanish-speaking) administrative-secretarial San Francisco worker and Muni commuter and have been a resident voter since 1968.

I believe San Franciscans would be better served if suitable inquiry and evaluation preceded passage of locally needed and desired legislation and tax revenue expenditures to assure anticipated results. San Francisco’s Charter permits supervisorial inquiry into expenditures. I strongly support thoroughly researched legislation and tax revenue use to benefit the peoples of San Francisco.

All of my sponsors know me to be a capable, persistent fighter for principles and public benefit and believe I would be an excellent supervisor.

The sponsors for Suzanne Alberto are:
L. J. Alberto, 4156-25th St., Communication Technician
Alvin E. Bernstein, 6 Rounok St., Computer Analyst
David Carlson Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Tape Librarian
Sarah M. Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Programmer/analyst
Rose Violet Descelo, 215 Niagara Ave., Retired Bookkeeper
Deirdre D. Dunlap, 125 DeMontfort Ave., Telecomm Specialist
R. L. Feather, 111 Inverness St., Secretary
Angel Fernandez, Jr., 1419-11th Ave., Security Officer
David L. Forks, 26 Shields St., Janitor
Paul F. Garm, 2387-44th Ave., Security Guard
Joyce A. Glynn, 38 Serrano Dr., Legal Secretary
Margery M. Gray-Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Financial Administrator
Amy J. Koehler, 2006 Fell St., Office Manager
Cheryl Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Housewife
Cherylene Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Writer
David Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Truck Driver
Ruth Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Housewife
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St., Custodian
Dewey W. McNell, 251 Topeka Ave., Utility Engineer
Leon Medina, 1725 Church St., Retired-Laborer
Nathan Nemier, 125 Cumbo Dr., Retired-Produce Buyer
Patricia J. Powell, 2006 Fell St., Publishing
Petty Randall, 366 Wilde St., Grocery Clerk
Roberto Samperea, 328 Staples Ave., Sr. Drafter
Clifford C. Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Mechanic
Tina Taturo, 646 Ellis St., Clerical
E. L. Thompson, 11 Inverness St., Student
Kenneth E. Tucker, Jr., 243 Hahn St., Building and Grounds Patrolman

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

ROGER BOSCHETTI

My address is 20 Carnelian Way
My occupation is Television Producer, Host, Writer, and Labor Consultant
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of involvement with working men, women, and young people, and as a concerned citizen, I will work to implement laws which will benefit all the people of San Francisco, such as reducing payroll and business tax, so as to encourage small businesses to come or stay in San Francisco, thereby creating more jobs. Will implement constructive changes in muni for speedier, safer and effective service, I will also create better programs to help the needs of our young men and women, I would like more police foot patrol, and more affordable housing, with more concern for our senior citizen

Roger Boschetti

The sponsors for Roger Boschetti are:
William A. Arietta, 16 Wheat St., Police Officer
Rita M. Belli, 1958 Greenwich St., Assessment Clerk
Rachel Boschetti, 20 Carnelian St., Cosmetologist
George Contessi-Turner, 631 O’Farrell St., Instructor/Professor
Bernard M. Crotty, 2971-29rd Ave., City Employee
John E. Downey, 83 Gaviota Way, Nationally Known Referee/
Limo Driver/Boxing Judge
Curtis Elliott, 300 Glenview Dr., Doorman
Evelyn C. Fitzgerald, 230 Stonecrest Dr., School Administrator
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Dr., Labor Consultant
Robert Jacobs, 1458-9th Ave., Business Agent
Roger Micheli, 2653 Chestnut St., Goldengate Disposal
Robert T. Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Lieutenant S.F.P.D. Retired
Shirley Robin Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Investigator
Marie G. Neilson, 379 Maynard Street, Businesswoman
Marie Ann Perri, 80 Malta St., Corporate Secretary
Joseph J. Phillips, 1203 Clayton St., Attorney
John J. Ricci, 1324 Broadway, Lawyer
Don L. Rotan, 134 Gilbert St., Writer
Samuel Smith, 297 Allison St., Seaman Cook
Carmen Solis, 39 Majestic Ave., Restaurant Owner
Rose M. Tarantino, 160 Country Club Dr., Housewife
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
John J. Vidal, Sr., 1437 Judah St., Office Manager
Winston Wong, 225 Anza Vista Ave., Manager of American Cab Co.
Herman W. Young, 210 Brookdale Ave., Seaman
Maya Dhillon-Zygi, 455 Chenery St., Homemaker

RICHARD BRADLEY

My address is 1 Ardath Court
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As a supporter of the Spartacist League I twice tore down the Confederate flag of slavery which flies no more in Civic Center. The American Civil War did not complete its historic mission. It will take a third American revolution, a socialist revolution, to liberate black people.

Spence Reagan’s anti-Soviet war plans and union-busting austerity drive by mass strike action! U.S. imperialism—hands off Central America! Smash Klan/Nazi terror through labor/black action! Break with Democrats—enemies of labor/minorities! Build a workers party that will stop at nothing short of socialist revolution and a workers government!

Richard Bradley

The sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2460-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Iekegami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lepez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 414-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennyse Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

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

HARRY BRITT
My address is 783A Guerrero Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: As a full-time Supervisor, I’ve worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making city government respond to our needs.
• I’ve supported crime-reducing neighborhood patrols to protect seniors;
• fought to repeal the sewer service charge;
• worked to protect the quality of our neighborhoods and environment;
• secured funding for anti-gay violence programs, AIDS prevention, community arts programs;
• sponsored protections for renters and small businesses from skyrocketing rents;
• worked to create affordable housing;
• sponsored equal pay for comparable jobs;
• worked to have downtown pay its share of taxes;
• worked to save jobs when companies moved from San Francisco.

Harry G. Britt

The sponsors for Harry G. Britt are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Sala Burton, 8 Slot Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hanneussey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister, Community College Board Member
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Member, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Regent-University of California
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner, Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-23th St., President, Harvey Milk Club
Sai Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., President, Alice B. Toklas Club
Wayne Friday, 1095-14th St., Newspaper Political Editor
Tom Murray, 4715 Balboa St., Newspaper Editor
Thomas F. Waddell, M.D. 141 Albion St., Athletic Games Organizer
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Affordable Housing/Tenant’s Rights Worker
Edward L. Peet, 350 Arbello Dr., Senior Citizen’s Advocate
John Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Sierra Club
Louise Ogden, 1674 Fillbert St., President, National Women’s Political Caucus
Leon Bruschen, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Howard Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Andrea Jepson, 1334 Masonic Ave., Nuclear Freeze Leader
Philip E. De Andrade, 601 Mississippi St., Small Business Owner
Georgianna Lynn, 165 El Verano St., West Portal Avenue Business Owner
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon St., Registered Nurse

RANDALL DWayne BRONNER
My address is 1390 Market Street
My occupation is artist-musician
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: San Francisco Budget Surplus-$162 Million.
• Muni Fare/Fast Pass Revenue-$46 Million.
• Aspen, Colorado-Free buses ten years.
• Portland-Free buses downtown.

We residents pay for more than two thirds of Muni’s cost in our taxes. Residents should ride Muni for free!
You must check out the murals supporting Peace in Central America on Balmy Street.

Please call 864-8641 if you’d like to meet the survivors of 1906, free, at the Great Earthquake Exposition.

If you want to brighten up your street call San Francisco Street Gardeners for free cuttings, succulents, and flowers, at the same number.

Randall Bronner

The sponsors for Randall Bronner are:
Salig R. Raphael, 495-32nd Ave., Survivor 1906 Quake
Jan Daremacker, 9 Central Ave., Reporter
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
William T. Witter, 948 Haight St., Artist
James T. Lyon, 1761 Page St., Musician
F. Kelly Harrin, 119 Margaret Ave., Cateress
Julie Tuncil, 1633 Washington St., Waitress
Raymundo E. Pen, 1470 Fulton St., Waiter
Mary L. Martinez, 295 Moscovich St., Secretary
Sandra Renzi, 861 Post St., Waitress and Prep Work
Giorgio Irving, 1390 Market St., Waiter
Martin James, 1139 Broadway, Bartender
Elizabetth Kelly, 32-49 Pierce St., Restaurant Services
Anthony R., Parnello, 312 Precita Ave., Artist
Carlos Gonzalez, 3409-20th St., Community Worker
Robert Burns, 2548 Folsom St., Carpenter
Susan Cervantes, 398 Precita St., Artist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
James A. Lewis, 3030 Cabrillo St., Artist/Teacher
Julianne Malveaux, 26 Winfield St., Economist
JONATHAN BULKLEY

My address is 147 Tenth Avenue
My occupation is Architect, Neighborhood Planner
My age is 54

My qualifications for office are: Experienced Architect and Planner. President, Planning Association for the Richmond; Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. Member: Open Space Committee, Mayor’s Task Forces for Parking, Mechanical Amusement Devices and Sidewalk Displays.

My Architecture/Planning background will help me respond to the need for a coherent vision of San Francisco as a City that works for everyone.

My priorities include:
- Housing for those most in need—singles, working women, seniors.
- Crime-free streets
- Civil service preference for San Francisco residents.
- Caring solutions to seniors’ needs.
- Eliminating Bay pollution.
- Maintaining Neighborhood Character, Diversity, and Liveability.

The interests of San Francisco Residents will always come first!

Jonathan BULKLEY

The sponsors for Jonathan Bulkley are:
- Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Tenant Representative, Rent Stabilization Board
- Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., S.F. Housing Commissioner
- Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Ter., Former City Planning Commissioner
- Lee Dolton, 1755 Beach St., Professor; Former Supervisor
- Jose Luis Fernandez, 464-43rd Ave., Businessman; Vice President, MAPA
- Russell B. Flynn, 2610 Filbert St., President, Rent Stabilization Board
- Ann Fogelberg, 2980 Vallejo St., Housewife; Vice Pres., Cow Hollow Association
- Terry Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney; Former Supervisor
- Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Public Utilities Commissioner
- Robert E. Gonzalez, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer
- Ruth Gravante, 74 Mizpah St., Glen Park Association
- Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Port Commissioner; Past President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
- John Hooper, 201 Buena Vista East, Conservationist; President, Buena Vista Neighborhood Ass’n
- Don Horanzy, 84 Kelloch Ave., Former Supervisor
- John H. Kirkwood, 1635 Green St., Member, BART Board
- Bill Kuhns, 421-26th St., Co-Chair, Open Space Committee
- Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
- Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner
- Richard Livingston, 380 Eddy St., Administrator, Realty House
- West; Member, Open Space Committee
- Peter McCrea, 1024 Lake St., Businessman; Past Pres., Public Utilities Comm.
- Amy Meyer, 3627 Clement St., Rec. & Park Commissioner
- William F. O’Keefe, Sr., 444 Corbett Ave., President, S.F. Taxpayers Association
- Thomas R. Peretti, 3787-16th St., Banker; President, C.R.I.R.
- Alan Raznick, 237 Topaz Way, Attorney; President, Coalition for S.F. Neighborhoods
- Toby Rosenblatt, 3409 Pacific Ave., Businessman; Pres., City Planning Commission
- Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
- Sam Valentino, 300 College Ave., Retired; Past President St. Mary’s Park Improvement Club

DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I am a supporter of the Spartacists, the labor/socialists who put a stop to flying the Confederate flag, banner of KKK racism and slavery, in Civic Center. Finish the Civil War! Forward to a workers government!

Without socialist revolution catastrophe threatens mankind. We need an integrated workers party that will take the productive wealth from the capitalist bosses, and establish a workers government and socialist planned economy.

Spike Reagan reaction through mass strikes! Military victory to Salvadoran leftists! Defend the USSR! No support to Democrats—liberal party of imperialism! Smash Taft-Hartley! Labor’s gotta play hardball to win!

Diana Coleman

The sponsors for Diana Coleman are:
- Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
- Richard Bradley, 1 Ardath Ct., Maintenance Building
- Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
- Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
- Jo Ana Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
- William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
- David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
- Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
- Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
- Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
- Jeff E. Higgins, 2430-28th Ave., Electrician
- Kathy Bega, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
- Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
- Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
- Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
- Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
- Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
- Steven A. Siegel, 414-26th St., Postal Worker
- Dennise Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
- Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student
Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR M. DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Accounting Services

My qualifications for office are: My experience with community groups and City Hall is extensive.

Involved in local politics through neighborhood and merchant associations, worked on campaigns for Diane Feinstein, and many others. Served the community through the following organizations: Vice President, Clement Merchants, head of legislative committee; Consultant to Polk Merchants; Member, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Roundtable, Vice Chair Health Committee; Board, California Alcohol Treatment Services; Chairperson Alcohol Awareness; Appointee, Mayor's Task Force on Sidewalk Vending, Parking; San Francisco Outlook, Project Manager; Member, SPUR; Boardmember Public Research Institute, SFSU.

A loyal devotee of San Francisco. I will serve honestly with an open mind and heart.

Eleanor M. Davis

EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES

My address is 695 John Muir Drive
My occupation is Banker
My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: Forty-four years after my grandparents were married here in San Francisco just seven months after the nineteen hundred and six earthquake. A beautiful blond hair, blue eyed baby boy came bouncing out of St. Joseph's Hospital. Studying economics at St. Mary's College after attending Riordan and then leaving religious life to create a conservation newspaper. Trying to educate local residents about the serious problems that we faced here in San Francisco and the bay area. It allowed to fulfill my dreams of what we can accomplish I will gladly give twenty-five per cent of my salary to charity.

Edward Michael Hayes

The sponsors for Edward Michael Hayes are:

Edwin B. Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Miriam Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Agnes Cassidy, 385 Day St., Retired
Anna M. d'Ottillie, 1356 Dolores St., Housewife
Bertram J. d'Ottillie, 1356 Dolores St., Retired
Mary M. Driscoll, 342-28th St., Administrative Assistant
John L. Flynn, 54 Seaview Terr., Banker
Elaine M. Gillerman, 135 Randall St., Banker
Rae Grubstick, 2479-40th Av., Banker
Marcia Kocel, 44 Malloren Way, Bank Clerk
Berenice Langley, 460 Duncan St., Retired
Bernadine K. Lough, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William G. Lough, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William D MacGillivray, 2720-35th Ave., Banker
Michael J McCarthy, 3744-22nd St., Retired
Nora S. McManus, 456 Duncan St., Retired
Ellen McSweeney, 457 Duncan St., Retired
Allene P. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Mary C. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Leona F. Parker, 56 Harper St., Housewife
James L. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Clerk
Jane M. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Secretary
Rita M. Phipps, 250 Prospect Av., Retired
Eugene F. Sullivan, 456 Duncan St., Ironworker
Catherine C. Tassone, 1795 Sanchez St., Clerk
Nellie Twomey, 1325 Church St., Home-maker
Seymour Whiteman, 3150 Clair St., Investment Broker
Ann M. Willis, 1365 Dolores St., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT DANIEL INGRAHAM
My address is 1637 Noriega Street
My occupation is Political Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Over one hundred years ago two great men, David Broderick and Edward Baker, gave their lives to save this Republic.
I ask you voters to compare these two San Franciscans with the small minded politicians of today.
Pathetic Wendy Nelder says "Fluoride causes AIDS"; degraded Willie Brown corrupts us with "Oh What a Night" baccalania; Feinstein lusts for higher office, and the rest are worse.
San Francisco can play an historic role in the development of the Pacific Basin. But you, our citizens, must decide. I urge you: Join with me and other candidates of Lyndon LaRouche's NDPC in our fight.
Robert Daniel Ingraham

RUBY T. JIMENEZ
My address is 961 Delano Avenue
My occupation is Directory Sales Representative
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: A San Francisco resident since, 1948 and a naturalized American of Mexican decent, I consider myself an earnest interpreter of human needs for the Hispanic community and other minorities. Misinterpretations, injustices, lack of communication and mutual respect must be addressed and aired. These human needs for minorities and others can be solved if we end the current world depression. The humane world economic policies of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly his proposal for joint economic development between the United States and Ibero-America (Operation Juarez) can end this depression. The port of San Francisco should be expanded to become a strong world trade center.
Ruby T. Jimenez

The sponsors for Robert Ingraham are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Bellich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Holward M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elonia Hardy, 143 Parnalones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jiminez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative

The sponsors for Ruby T. Jimenez are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Stanley J. Bolinski, 1909 Eddy St., Staff Clerk
Willa W. Coleman, 215 Munich St., Sales Representative
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
Patricia L. Hardy, 178 Broad St., Assistant Manager
Patricia Helton, 93 Prentiss St., Teacher, Mission Community College
Andrea Konviser Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Orn Lee Jones, 359 Orizaba Ave., Staff Clerk
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
ClaEsther Miller, 32 Balston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozalitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ANDREW ("DADDY ANDY") JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Criminology Student
My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I have been a respected citizen and server of San Francisco for 25 years. I'm involved in many community organizations that care for our community such as Glide church, Red Cross volunteers and the Singel parents resource center. I've been appointed to sit on the board of such organizations as "Mission Coalition, Mission Model Neighborhood and the Mission Education program, (appointed by Mayor Alioto and Mayor Moscone). I'd like to deacitate my Supervioral campaign to a few of the many people who helped me over the years, Chef Roy Hammerich, Betty Romenoff and the Mission Childcare Consortium.

Andrew Daddy Andy Jones

WILLIE B. KENNEDY

My address is 950 Duncan Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: In my three years as Supervisor, I have worked to maintain and improve the unique quality of life we have in San Francisco—from rent control to fighting for parks and open spaces. I honor our rich diversity of cultures and life styles through support of neighborhood preservation and the rights of all groups—from children to seniors.

I initiated a campaign to control the tragic increase in child abuse; and am working hard on the problem of decreased employment, particularly for youth.

I want to continue serving your interests in making this the most liveable city in the United States.

Willie B. Kennedy

The sponsors for Andrew (Daddy Andy) Jones are:

Stephen Harold Irvine, 2037 15th St., Carpenter
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Joseph A. DelCarlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Chairperson of MHD
David L. Butler, 995 Shotwell St., Salesman
Diane Mouzani, 43 Watchman Way, Graduate Student
David Levinson, MD, 2927 Folsom St., Physician
Helen Butler, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife
Joseph A. Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Cashier
S. Ferry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect
Rose Sillard, 10 Lucky St., Housewife
John Maras, 20-12th St., Student
Donald Strickland, 981 Shotwell St., Musician & Carpenter
Juanita Del Carlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Hiring Hall Director
Dorothy Herrera, 360 Holyoke St., Educator
Delmar T. Burge, 142 Central Ave., Professional Musician
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Jose S. Valencia, 751 Castro St., Job Developer
Peter Anthony Rivera, 57 Peters Ave., Counselor
Fernando Cosio, 177 Johnstone Dr., Executive Director
Miguel Quiroz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Social Worker
Harry W. Madison, 4017 Folsom St., Appliance Repair
Paul Sussman, 1343 Third Ave., Housing Finance
Carmencita L. De la Cruz, 2763 Bryant St., Accountant
Kathryn M. McCamant, 625 Scott St., Tenant Organizer
Lynne Beeson, 2135-28th Ave., Grants Coordinator
Harry E. Baker, 1345 Clement St., Project Coordinator

The sponsors for Willie B. Kennedy are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Elected Official, Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Art Agnos, 657 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor/Airport Commissioner
Al Borvick, 234 Gates St., Attorney At Law
Harry G. Brit, 783-A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Agrinino R. Cerbottos, 471 Hoffman St., Member, Board of Education
Handy Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant, Commissioner PUC
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Union Official
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Aldo P. Lora, 1177 California St., Electrical Contractor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nobhill St., Philanthropist
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Supervisor
James McCray, Jr., 164-6th Ave., Minister
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
Adolph Schuman, 1170 Sacramento St., Businessman
Stan Smith, 15 Heart Ave., Union Official
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hihilitas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Candidates for Supervisor

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 121 Golden Gate Avenue
My occupation is Musician
My qualifications for office are: I am one of many in unity with San Francisco's diversity. I "Keyes" will open doors for you, to: homes, jobs, health care, better schools, provide more: complimentary fine arts, concerts, veterans benefits, senior services; close doors on pornography, drugs and prostitution; clean our streets and make them safe once more; eliminate wasteful spending and lower your taxes. For reasons like these, I am your "Keyes". Never again, will any San Franciscan go wanting, while "special interest" lick their fingers. Let us shine bright, the city that knows how, a guiding light to world peace now.

God help us.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys are:
Gary Gene Adams, 139-5th Ave., Plastic Fabricator
Wayne Austin, 391 Leavenworth St., Job Developer
Brian Chew, 334-30th Ave., Restaurant Worker
Ginger Coyote Coleman, 734 Bush St., Editor of Funk Globe
Hugh T. Dauley, 1177 California St., Computer Operator
Thomas A. Finney, 165 Turk St., Disabled/SSI
Howard M. Grayson, 160 Eddy St., Community Coordinator,
Hosp. House
Louis J. Gwerder, 427 Valley St., Laborer
Mickey C. Helmcl, 777 Tehama St., Patriot
John R. Hess, 554 Broadway St., Doorman
Kevin M. Kennedy, 250 McClister St., Social Worker
Patricia E. Kerman, 1026 Montgomery St., Film Maker
John Lyman, 149-6th St., Musician
Patrick Marsh, 231-27th St., Chef
Perry V. Matlock, 520-6th Ave., Teacher
Michelle Miller, 15 Surrey St., Student
David M. Moebes, 350 Frederick, Symphonic Musician
Keith F. Moog, 1233 Guerrero St., Controller
Gary Posner, 443 Broadway St., Engineer
Stephen Present, 373 Ellis St., Security Officer
Clark Sullivan, 765 Ellis St., Political Activist
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Office/Clerical
Robin Vega, 1330 Jessie St., Courier
Joseph Wagner, 121 Goldengate Ave., Musician
James E. Washington, Jr. 55 Mason St., Consultant, Arts and Science
Guy West, 640 Polk St., Broadcasting
Linda Marie White, 777 Tehama St., Seamstress

DAVID L. KILBER

My address is 1901 Noriega Street
My occupation is Management Consultant
My age is 40
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of Oregon State University, a Vietnam Veteran, and a former candidate for California State Assembly. I have resided in the Sunset district with my wife Susan for five years.

I stand for a strong defense policy including the Beam Weapon anti-missile defense and the technology boom this new “Apollo” program will bring to the local economy.

San Francisco must become a center for science, classical culture, and trade, bringing blue-collar families and industry back to this city. We must expand the Port of San Francisco and launch the Pacific Basin development strategy proposed by economist Lyndon LaRouche.

David L. Kilber

The sponsors for David L. Kilber are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Swoony St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Swoony St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Swoony St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Swoony St., College Student
Philip A. Beilich, 5226 Fellson St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 357 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elvira Hardy, 143 Barolino St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales
Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezzano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 132 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Purtill, 185 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 164-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Zoriais, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
Edith Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retired
J.G. Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retailer

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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QUENTIN L. KOPP

My address is 68 Country Club Drive
My occupation is Attorney/Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Local government is us, because we depend upon it to provide essential services and wise leadership. For 13 years I've fought to cut governmental waste and excessive taxation, to keep government honest and on its toes. My efforts have already saved taxpayers over $250,000,000 and I'm proud to be the one supervisor who watches how every dollar is spent. This year City government will spend an average $4,500,000 a day, every day. I want to continue my role as your "financial watchdog" in City Hall and add a needed balance to the Board. I would very much appreciate your support.

Quentin L. Kopp

The sponsors for Quentin L. Kopp are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Former Mayor
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Former Member of the Board of Supervisors
A. Marquez Bautista, 1555 Powell St., Attorney at Law
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1500 Gough St., Housewife
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Businessperson
Robert C. Elkus, 469 Magnolia Ave., Attorney at Law
George Evankovich, 1600-A Greenwich St., Labor Representative
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Jack E. Frankel, 72-22nd Ave., Rabbi
Merle Zellerbach Goerner, 225 Presidio Ter., Author/Journalist
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Attorney at Law
Carleton Goodlett, 2060 O'Farrell St., Publisher
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author/Retired Publisher
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Golda Kaufman, 2900 Pacific Ave., Homemaker/Volunteer
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070-26th Ave., Congressional Assistant
Joseph P. Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
John Lo Schiavo, 2130 Fulton St., Priest/Educator
Haig G. Mardikian, 2960 Divisadero St., Businessman
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired President of City Employees
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Bobb Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Harrriet C. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Self Employed Businesswoman
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Police Commissioner
Dorothy Vukovich, 177 San Aleso Ave., Housewife/Volunteer
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo Drive
My occupation is Political Scientist/Educator
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: impressive. A full decade of political activism at national, state, and local levels. Leadership roles in labor, housing, and education. To illustrate my seriousness in leading our City, I have launched the following initiative campaigns:
* A 3-year rent freeze
* Commercial rent control
* A balanced budget
* Expedition of labor disputes
* Driver-ownership of taxicabs
* An outdoor stadium in front of Moscone Center

As your supervisor, I will pursue:
* District elections for district councils
* Metro services for the Richmond, Marina, Bayview
* Higher police standards
* More schools and parks

You need me now, San Francisco! Who else you gonna call?

Julian O. Lagos

The sponsors for Julian Lagos are:
Charles Martin Adams, 54 4th St., Cab Driver
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 577 Arballo Dr., Psychologist
Elizabeth Alvarez, 1262 La Playa St., Sales
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall St., Computer Consultant
Elizabeth Benford, 508 Andover St., Attorney
Katherine Bobowski, 417 Stockton St., Unemployed
Thomas J. Callan, 17 Sutro Heights Blvd, Consultant
James D. Cantor, 742 Treat Ave., Station Attendant
Henry Conserva, 1258 40th Ave., Professor
Leon Datangel, 725 Van Ness Ave., Businessman
Peggy L. Dickson, 320 Monticello, Student
Mark Emery, 355 Taylor St., Artist
James Michael Faye, 1369-B Page St., Tenant Advocate
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore St., Videographer
Ken Johnson, 42 Kellogg St., Cabdriver
Vincent B. Latimer, 4118-A 24th St., Service Manager
Richmond Loewinsonn, 1341 Valencia St., Writer
John B. Lorette, 905 Columbus Ave., Cab Driver/Fisherman
Berniece Martin, 506 Church St., Public Stenographer
Jonathan Me Curdy, 80 Alvarado St., Attorney
Victor E. Miller, 1341 Valencia St., Editor
Steven A. Schectman, 1301 20th St., Attorney
William F. Taylor, 1890 Clay St., Operating Engineer
Frank S. Warner, 2530 Fillmore St., Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 249 Cotter St., Legal Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JULIANNE MALVEAUX

My address is 26 Winfield Street
My occupation is Economics Professor/Labor Specialist/Writer
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: Native San Francisco and former White House staffer (1977–78) Dr. Julianne Malveaux (pronounced “Mal-Voh”) is an elected California State Central Committeewoman who is committed to a diverse San Francisco:
—San Francisco Tomorrow Board Member
—Booker T. Washington/Ella Hill Hutch Board Member
—Strong Supporter: Mondale-Ferraro
—Steering Committee, San Francisco Plan Initiative
—Delegate candidate for Jesse Jackson
—Former staff, President's Council of Economic Advisors
—Ph.D. (Economics, MIT)
—Co-author of three books
—Columnist, San Francisco Sun Reporter
—Priority focus: job creation programs for youth, minorities, and women
—Author, 1984 Ballot Proposition J which prohibits San Francisco pension fund investments in South Africa.

Julianne Malveaux

The sponsors for Julianne Malveaux are:

Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
Geoffith Brecka, 609 Kappas A. Lawyer, City Commissioner
Randall Bronner, 1390 St., Artist/Musician
Rene Casenave, 2821-22nd St., Housing Advocacy
Terence Faulkner, 2371 42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Thomas C. Fleming, 2171 O'Farrell St., Journalist
Jerry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Margaret A. Gannon, 3649-18th St., Attorney
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Y'Vonne Golden, 1743-9th Ave., School Administrator
Peter M. Good, 709 Shader St., Arborist
Roberto Y. Hernandez, 852 Moultrie St., Director, Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer
Odis W. Kahn, 3259 Clay St., Transportation Commissioner
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Michael Koblenz, 825 Masonic Ave., Distributor
Orelia Langston, 55 Friendship Way, Senior and Geriatric Specialist
Arthur Lathan, 2350-48th Ave., Personnel Administrator
Michael C.Miller, 1920 Quint St., Attorney
Jack D. Morrison, 44 Woodland Ave., Management consultant
Carl Dialo Reece, 2034-46th Ave., Graduate Student
Ruth Gordon Schnapp, 726-23rd Ave., Structural Engineer
Frances M. Shanken, 259-32nd Ave., Consumer Rights Advocate
Anita Silvers, 15 Otsego St., Professor, S.F. State
Arlo Smith, 66 Fernwood Way, District Attorney
Bruce M. St Cyr, 343 Chester Ave., Vice President AFSCE Local 2620
DaV. Strickland, 1664 Fulton St., Administrator
Calvin Welch, 319 Ashbury St., Community Consultant

JOHN L. MOLINARI

My address is 30 16th Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: To make San Francisco work takes both good ideas and cooperation with everyone.
For over 12 years as your Supervisor, my contribution has been to bring together both the diverse viewpoints of San Francisco's many communities and the other Supervisors to solve our City's problems. With your support, I've:
—Promoted the construction of more housing; limited condominium conversions to protect renters; protected tenants from rent gougers and outrageous security deposits;
—Initiated escort services to protect seniors;
—Initiated preferential parking and parking ticket amnesty programs;
—Protected our neighborhood character from big companies forcing out small merchants; and
—Protected San Francisco's parks and playgrounds.

John L. Molinari

The sponsors for John L. Molinari are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
John Francis Foran, 900 Rockdale Dr., State Senator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongo, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Louise K. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Homemaker/Media Producer
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venust St., Member, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Pastor
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Eloise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director, Patient Advocacy
Gordon J. Lau, 340 19th Ave., Member, Port Commission
Yost Wada, 365 4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Duke J. Armstrong, 352 Divisadero St., Former President, C.R.I.R.
Paul Boneberg, 647-A Castro St., President, Stonewall Gay Political Club
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, Community United Against Violence
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter (B.A.R.)
Carole Migden, 56 28th St., Member, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Political Club
Sal Roselli, 349 Lexington Way, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Political Club
Maureen J. Conway, 650 Eucalyptus Dr., Homemaker
John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Chair, Sierra Club Bay Chapter
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, San Francisco National Women's Political Caucus
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Sunset District Merchant

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PAT NORMAN
My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Senior Health Care Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I am a political progressive with extensive professional experience as an administrator, program consultant, mediator, and service provider. These skills and my perspective will be valuable additions to the Board.
My commitment to economic and social justice is backed by 25 years of community service to ethnic and cultural minorities, women, low- and moderate-income families, elders, youth, gay people, small businesses, workers, the disabled, and government policy-makers.
I support neighborhood preservation, affordable housing measures (including rent control), jobs and job training for San Franciscans, comparable worth, and environmental safeguards.
I am a parent and San Francisco homeowner.

Pat Norman

JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS
My address is 1203 Clayton Street
My occupation is Executor (Probate Attorney)
My qualifications for office are: This is not New York. My grandfather worked for this city for thirty-six years; helping to make San Francisco the greatest place on earth in which to live. Now our city bus system has to go hat in hand to Los Angeles to borrow buses. The quality of care at our general hospital has come under extreme question. The city of love, tolerance, and understanding is becoming more and more divided by every hate on earth. I, as a fourth generation San Franciscan, call upon you to join with us natives in the fight to keep San Francisco San Francisco.

Joseph James Phillips

The Sponsors for Joseph J. Phillips are:
Margaret Moskovitz Berzin, 2201 Lake St., Retired
Ernest Lott, 979 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
Amelia Sheehan, 436-27th Ave., Homemaker
Salvador Garza, 795 Brunswick St., Businessman
Gerald E. Gallagher, 2282-34th Ave., Retired
Jean M. McDermott, 325-9th Ave., Tax Preparer
A. John Shimmou, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Juanita G Cardinelli, 1215-18th St., Retired
Peter G. Economou, 240 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Laura Lott, 979 Avalon Ave., Volunteer for Handicapped
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Consuelo G. MacDonald, 801-44th Ave., Retired
Roger Boschetti, 20 Carnelian St., Television Producer
Jody S. Hirota, 571-19th Ave., Dental Hygienist
Mairce C. Bihan, 111 Willard North St., Salesman
Kelly Lyon, 435-25th Ave., Secretary
Ralph A. Barsi, 1235 Athens St., Retired Teamster
Laura B. Campbell, 1275-32nd Ave., NOW
William E. Beyers, Jr, 3223 Geary Blvd, Printer
Pearle Wong, 1555 Shadrer St., Housewife
Sophia E. Conley, 2845 Cabrillo St., Teacher
Jimmy Starr, 23 Boardman Pl., Lawyer
Hannah Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
John L. Santiago, 150 Woodland Ave., Retired
Walter J. Murphy, 767 Corbett Ave., Retired
Carl H. Hoppe, 100 Hamilton St., Retired
Jack I Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
Sam Kekstein, 84 Lopez Ave., Self Employed
Helen Marie Sheehan, 875-38th Ave., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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LOUISE RENNE

My address is 3725 Jackson Street  
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.  
My age is 47  
My qualifications for office are: As Finance Committee chairperson I have protected vital services while cutting wasteful expenditures. Sound policies have been implemented. San Francisco is on solid financial footing.  
At the same time I played a leadership role in legislation affecting the environment, health care, Munl, the arts, indeed all San Franciscans (including our seniors and children).  
My prior experience includes Deputy Attorney General, Criminal and Environmental Units; argued cases in Supreme Court; President, California Women Lawyers.  
As an effective Supervisor, I pledge to continue my hard work, to act responsibly and compassionately, and to speak honestly on the critical issues affecting all San Franciscans.  

LOUISE RENNE

The sponsors for Louise Renne are:  
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman 16th District  
Bernard Averbach, 59 Rivoli St., Public Relations  
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director—CYO—Urban Development  
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Pres. Airport Commission  
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner  
Harry G. Britt, 783A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors  
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister  
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress  
Thomas J. Cahill, 246-17th Ave., Chief of Police, Retired  
Lily Cuneo, 3819 Jackson St., Housewife  
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor  
Anne W. Halsted, 1380 Montgomery St., Vice President, Personnel  
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco  
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Vice President, ILGWU  
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman/Commissioner  
John S. Jennings, 2743 San Bruno Ave., Realtor (Ret.)  
LeRoy King, 75 Tampa Lane, Regional Director of ILWU  
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher  
Leslie M. Lawrence, 2423 Broadway, Certified Public Accountant  
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner and Attorney  
Melvin D. Lee, 450-22nd Ave., Engineer (Commissioner, S.F. Redevelopment Agency)  
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator  
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist  
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor, State of California  
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco  
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher  
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Business Representative  
Thomas C. Scanlon, 651 Vicente St., Investment Advisor  
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, SF Board of Supervisors  
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist  

CAROL RUTH SILVER

My address is 68 Ramona Avenue  
My occupation is Incumbent  
My age is 45  
My qualifications for office are: Experience: Seven years a San Francisco Supervisor; twenty years a practicing attorney; mother of two.  
—Responsiveness to neighborhoods:  
—My parking reform legislation will open up neighborhood parking spaces.  
—My fire and smoke detector legislation will make our whole City more safe.  
—Advocate for fairness legislation:  
—preserving sunlight in parks  
—outlawing gay discrimination  
—creating low and moderate income housing  
—repairing City streets and buildings  
—rent control  
—protecting Chinatown merchants  
—S.A.F.E. and Senior Escort Programs  
—Neighborhood Arts Programs  
—reducing smog  
—preserving San Francisco Bay  
—expanding Muni  
—wheelchair accessibility  
—more women and minorities receiving City contracts  
—child care  
I will continue to insist on fairness.  

CAROL RUTH SILVER

The Sponsors for Carol Ruth Silver are:  
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor  
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist  
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress  
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco  
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender  
George Agnos, 2131 Fursten Ave., City Attorney  
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., San Francisco Assemblyman  
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor  
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., San Francisco Supervisor  
Nancy G. Walker, 335 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors  
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., San Francisco Supervisor  
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education  
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Community College Board  
Morrin Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, President, Airport Commission  
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Utilities Commissioner  
Emmett D. Condon, 2506-21st Ave.  
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent  
Jule C. Anderson, 573-9th Ave., Education Specialist  
Tim M. Daynout, 645 Randolph St., Charity Media Specialist  
Teressa E. Griffin, 839-41st Ave., Retired Teacher  
Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired  
Samuel Jordan, 4006-3rd St., Caterer  
Tony Killoy, 473-11th Ave., Civil Engineer  
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster  
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Education  
Philahaim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney  
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney  
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Realtor  
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Business Representative  
Jack Trujillo, 74 Ramona St., Word Processor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DAVID C. SMITH

My address is 2567 Alemany Blvd
My occupation is Administrator, Service Agency
My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: I am a San Francisco State graduate in journalism, married, with a deep affection for this place. For seven years my wife and I have counseled families and individuals from every neighborhood in San Francisco—an investment and commitment to the future. Dealing with these problems has increased my awareness of this city's growing preoccupation with rights and shrinking concern for responsibilities. The solution includes a return to basics, to strong family units, to solid values, to the worth of all human life. I will be a voice for those who feel excluded, especially exploited children and the disadvantaged.

David C. Smith

The sponsors for David C. Smith are:

James Bailey, Sr., 422 Guerrero St., Minister
Lillian P. Bailey, 422 Guerrero St., Housewife
Janis Ann Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Secretary
Jeffrey Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Photographer
Robert R. Carlson, 337 Baden St., Radio Producer
Victoria A. Carlyle, 1805 Octavia St., Political Analyst
John William Castro, 3 Plymouth St., Mover
John Frederick Decker, 1090 Eddy St., Designer
Frances Edwards, 2554 Alemany Blvd., Housewife
Daisy Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., Homemaker
David Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., High School President
James W. Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Police Officer
Jean Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Housewife
James H. Higgins, 270 Juanita Way, Pastor
Margaret M. Lee, 730-12th Ave., Secretary
Mark W. Lee, 881 Silver Ave., President, Simpson College
Arvid Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Norma Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Secretary
Philip Litton, 3430 San Bruno Ave., Student
John A. McGeehan, 1220 La Playa St., Military, U.S. Army
Charles A. McMillen, 1530 Lawton St., Clergy
J. Thad McKinney, 760 Kansas St., Station Manager
Marilyn G. Miller, 518 Dewey Blvd., Secretary
Chris Montgomery, 518 Dewey Blvd., Church Worker
Lawrence W. Pong, 254 Arch St., Environmental Health Inspector
James Douglas Robinson, 1319-7th Ave., Moving Company Manager
James W. Robinson, 518 Dewey Blvd., Executive Director of a Christian Service Organization
Conrad R. Sanchez, 1808 Octavia St., Restaurateur
Constance B. Steinbuch, 180 Lippard Ave., Homemaker

KEVIN STARR

My address is 445 Chestnut Street
My occupation is Businessman, Communicator, Professor
My age is 44

My qualifications for office are: Born in San Francisco, I relish the past, present and future of this great city. I know it from a variety of perspectives—as executive aide to Mayor Alioto, as City Librarian, as a newspaper columnist, as a professor, as a businessman, and as a person active in many civic causes. I now wish to bring my talents and experience to the Board of Supervisors. I believe I can be of unique service as the centrist advocate of this city as it looks to its future. That future, the well-being of each of us, will be my greatest concern.

Kevin Starr

The sponsors for Kevin Starr are:

Richard B. Allen, 2111 Franklin St., Merchant
Lynn A. Alshuler, 1490 Sacramento St., Associate Attorney
Thomas E. Anderson, 236 Moncada Way, Clergyman
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Job Training Director
Gino Braidelli, 700 Columbus Ave., Restaurateur
Sam Camhi, 265 San Anselmo Ave., Insurance Estate Planner
Frank J. Caudill, 1034 Chestnut St., Venture Capital Investor
Violet L. Chan, 1282 Vallejo St., Asian Art Commissioner
Elizabeth A. Cooley, 2820 Scott St., Legal Assistant
Paul Denning, 2165 California St., Investment Banker
Martin Eng, 655 Pine St., County Central Committee Member
James W. Han, 163 Prospect Ave., Attorney
Patrick E. Hallinan, 117-27th Ave., Attorney
Walter E. Hoadley, 999 Green St., Economist
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Allan S. Johnson, 165 Prospect Ave., Consultant
Dorwin Buck Jones, 245 Northpoint St., Gerontologist; Director, Meals on Wheels
Harold K. Lipset, 2500 Pacific Ave., Private Investigator
Frances A. Lopez, 1474 Sacramento St., Paralegal
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Editor
John Maher, 790-8th Ave., Executive
Roxanne Mankin, 2312 Pacific Ave., Investment Real Estate
Michael Marston, 3375 Jackson St., Real Estate and Development Consultant
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave., Asst. Business Manager, Local #38
John N. Rosekrans, Jr, 2840 Broadway, Businessman, Toy Manufacturer
Michael S. Sallano, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Businessman
Michael Strunsky, 2206 Bay St., Construction Executive
Brooks Walker, Jr., 2930 Broadway, Business Executive
Suzan Yee, 632-6th Ave., Attorney

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
JOHN E. WAHL
My address is 118C Connecticut Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have a 20 year record of voluntary, unpaid public service to San Francisco. I have worked with all levels of City government, with people in all parts of the City. Examples of my public service include being a Judge Pro Tem of the San Francisco Municipal Court, 9 years of service on the Board of the San Francisco Council of Churches, service on the Pride Foundation Board, and service to veterans.
I am dedicated to ensuring affordable places to live, a responsible and unprejudiced police department, decent jobs, and dependable transportation.
I am independent of special interest club politics.

John E. Wahl

The sponsors for John F. Wahl are:
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
John Riordan, 1426 Williard St., Vice President, Community College Board
Carolene W. Marks, 55 Jordan Ave., Economist and Civic Leader
James E. Sandmire, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
E. Patricia (Pat) Lucey, 69 Huntington Dr., Attorney
Benjamin L. Marcus, 84 Winfield St., Rabbi and Chaplain
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Walter W. Grumm, 3128-22nd St., Clergyperson
Ann Marie Day, 136 Delmar St., Retired Social Worker
Cleve Jones, 3663-18th St., Legislative Aide
Paul S. Yein, 342-8th Ave., Real Estate Agent
Hank Wilson, 1651 Market St., Hotel Operator
Fred L. Kurlander, 115 San Aleso, Attorney
Jean Wall Burgess, 421 Moraga Ave., Lawyer
Gary E. Myerscough, 158 Sproule Ln., Education Administrator
Paula F. Lichtenberg, 925 Jones St., Paralegal
Paul D. Hardman, 1762 Pacific Ave., Author, Retired Publisher
Jerry G. Guerra, 85 Fortuna St., Retailer
Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr., M.D., 2170 Hayes St., Physician
Foster W. Weeks, 1910 Greenwich St., Advertising Consultant
Shirley Kaiser, 806-33rd Ave., Teacher
Robert W. Shore, 146 Guerrero St., Businessman
Rosa M. Kwong, 512 Van Ness Ave., Law Student
Charlene Yamato, 416 Font Blvd., Secretary
Jeanette Sibley, 75 Woodhaven Ct., Classroom Teacher
Alan Thompson Smith, 190 Palo Alto Ave., Small Business Owner
William Earl Andrews, 4130 Army St., Taxi Driver
Larry E. Hughes, 87 Fortuna St., Paralegal/Consultant
Julita V. DeChavez, 1591-45th Ave., Deputy County Clerk

SYLVA WEINSTEIN
My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is Staff-writer for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 58
My qualifications for office are: My program:
Courts, cops and strikebreaking injunctions; two-gate, two-tiered, union-busting tactics, are helping employers depress living standards. Escalating health, housing and food costs are forcing working people—especially Blacks and Latinos—out of San Francisco. Corporate condos and highrises replace workers’ residences.
Door-key children of working parents, denied child-care, are left to roam the streets. Abortion clinics are under siege.
Only united labor—employed, unemployed, black, white—can change this condition. An independent labor party, based on the unions, must be built to replace the callous politicians of the two ruling capitalist parties.
Jobs not war! Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:
Alan A. Benjamin, 2783-20th St., Editor, Socialist Action
Paul Colvin, 558-36th Ave., Printer
Nancy G. Elnor, 615 Central Ave., Teacher
Ralph D. Forsyth, 77 Cedro St., Teacher
May May Gong, 25 Bessie St., Power Plant Operator
Nancy L. Gruber, 921 Alvarado St., Editor
Millie B. Gonzalez, 2543-32nd Ave., Student
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Longshoreman
Ruth Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Office Worker
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297-18th St., Retail Clerk
William G. Learmer, 535 Day St., Mechanic
Ann Menasche, 2149-48th Ave., Feminist Attorney
Linda I. Ray, 3740-25th St., Registered Nurse
Ann A. Robertson, 535 Day St., Professor
Joseph M. Ryan, 25 Bessie St., Machinist
Karen A. Schieve, 3575-19th St., Sales Clerk
Michael William Schreiber, 3993 Mission St., Muni Driver
Carole Seligman, 245 Whitney St., Muni Bus Driver
Kathryn Setian, 1394-16th Ave., Engineer
Margery Jeann VanDerslice, 1540-20th St., Registered Nurse
Christine Vaughn, 1255 Polk St., Poster or Clerk
David Walters, 2543-32nd Ave., Power Plant Operator
Bonnie Weinstein, 1716 Revere Ave., Student
Deborah Weinstein, 1830 Church St., Unemployed Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 489-27th St., Painter

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DAVE WHARTON

My address is 5031 Diamond Heights Blvd.
My occupation is Community Service Attorney
My age is 44


It's time for housing expansion, for transit, traffic, parking overhaul. Time for better City services, especially for seniors and youth. Time to strengthen economy, create jobs, control taxes. Time for neighborhood revitalization, parking relief. Time for human rights advancement, efficient and humane police services. Experiment with Board meetings in neighborhoods.

It's time for goals, results, citizen participation. San Francisco is world class city, small town; lose either, be neither. I build bridges, not barriers. Join our common sense coalition.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:

Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Libby Danebom, 200 St Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Douglas Chan, 386 Spruce St., Attorney/Rent Board Commissioner
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Russell Flynn, 2815 Pacific Ave., Real Estate/Rent Board Commissioner
Charles B. Renfrew, 791-14th Ave., Attorney/Former Federal Judge
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Hotel/Real Estate Executive
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Alicia Wang, 1418 Leavenworth St., Educational Specialist
Mortimer Fleishacker, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Investor
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
Diane C. Kefauver, 1726 Great Highway, Consultant
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Union President/Retired
Jose Gomez, 59 Grandview Ave., Legal Services/Executive Director
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
John L. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Insurance/Savings and Loan Chairman
Phyllis Kern, 306 Arbor St., Labor Union Secretary
Russell L. Kasman, 2454 Bush St., Businessman
Laura E. McBride, 925 Cole St., Typographer
George M. Raya, 90 Verna Ct., City Employee
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Development Executive
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Agent
Lawrence A. Wilson, 335-A Pierce St., Attorney—Community Volunteer
Deborah R. Pines, 4248-20th St., Financial Consultant
John T. McAlister, Jr, 999 Green St., Businessman
Bobbie Griffith, 50 Leland Ave., District Attorney Investigator
Edith Wellin, 185-A Alpine Ter., Teacher

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DICK CERBATOS
My address is 471 Hoffman Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have always been deeply interested in the education of youth. Before my appointment to the Board of Education two years ago, I served twenty years on Citizens’ Advisory and PTA committees focusing on education. As an engineer-business-owner, I also bring professional skills to the Board.
As a first generation American, I am sympathetic to minority children’s problems, and aware that public education is the golden gateway to opportunity and success.
I intend to continue pressing for higher test scores, improved discipline and morale, less truancy, and an increase in college admissions.
I am committed to excellence in education.
A. Richard Cerbatos

CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON
My address is 29 Oliver Street
My occupation is Transit Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I was born and raised in San Francisco, graduating from Balboa High.
For the past 7 years I have been active in the school district having been elected to 2 terms on the District Advisory Committee, 4 years as the chairperson of the Petal Academic Middle School Parent’s Group, and 5 years on the site advisory council at Petal.
I am married and have 2 children attending Commodore Sloat Elementary School.
I believe there is much work needed to provide the quality education our children need to prepare them for a highly technical society of computers and robotics.
Chris Christenson

The sponsors for Dick Cerbatos are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
A. Marguex Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Lawyer
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Bovice, 234 Gates St., Attorney at Law
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director
Judy Dellamonte, 3523 Taraval St., President, San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Annis W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President-Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Eugene S. Hopp, 606 Van Ness Ave., Physician
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Ralph F. Hurtado, 65 Newburg St., Executive Director
Mattle J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Labor-Vice President,
ILGWU
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir. ILWU
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Bette Wallace Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Ct., Homemaker
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 566-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, S.F. Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The sponsors for Christopher Christenson are:
Essie L. Webb, 186 Maddux Ave., Intake & Referral Specialist
Raymond Tunstall, 515 John Muir Dr., Deputy Sheriff
Francis Smyth, 1709-16th Ave., Deputy Sheriff
Harry E. Jensen, III, 74 Delmonte St., Electrical Transit Manager
Joe W. Turner, 1274 Palou Ave., Janitor Supervisor II
Martin Larkin, 4733 Lincoln Way, Paint Supervisor
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Supervisor II
Joseph Della Rosa, 50 Oliver St., Seaman
Precious Moore, 2046 Thomas Ave., Home Health Aide
Luna Sand Dute Kastina, 524 Clipper St., Clerk Typist
William Satchell, 500 Francisco St., Transit Car Cleaner
Roy W. Haver, 576 Lisbon St., Marble Shopman
Guadalupe Williams, 335 Heare Ave., Housewife
Jeanne L. Williams, 335 Heare Ave., Grocery Clerk
Roosevelt Lancaster, 170 Ledyard St., Transit Car Cleaner
Lena M. Quintana, 3331 Heare Ave., Housewife
Alfred Lent, 1475 Church St., Electrical Mechanic
George Williams, Sr., 335 Heare Ave., Retired
Beatrice L. Dunbar, 430 Thornton Ave., Retired
Vicente Williams, 335 Heare Ave., Driver
Gabriele, R. Wilkerson, 1347-15th Ave., Cashier

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
LIBBY DENEBEIM

My address is 200 St. Francis Blvd.
My occupation is Incumbent School Board Member
My qualifications for office are: Four years ago you elected me to the school board. I am deeply grateful.

I have worked hard. Student achievement scores improved, enrollment stabilized. We strengthened significantly special programs and alternative schools.

There remains much work to do. As a mother of six public school educated children, former teacher and experienced school board member, I know how our schools should work.

Many children today will finish school in the 21st Century. For all our children we must plan for the future, reaffirm our commitment to excellence, use school dollars prudently and ensure the momentum for improvement in our schools continues.

Libby Denebeim

The sponsors for Libby Denebeim are:

Robert S. Denebeim, 200 St Francis Blvd., Businessman
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
William K. Coblentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Patricia F. Costallo, 2838 Green St., Community Leader
Carlotta T. del Pinto, 94 Berkeley Way, Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Zuretti L. Goobys, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA Volunteer
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Thomas Halseh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Cynthia Brown Kelly, 460 Magellan St., Homemaker
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., Board of Education Member
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan St., Lt. Governor
Peter Mezey, 338 Clay St., Attorney/Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., Mental Health Director
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
Philip Bruce Raful, 962 Clayton St., SF Open Space Committee Member
Sal Roselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor/Gay Ledaer
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher/President, SF Federation of Teachers
Artie Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Pansy Ponziro Waller, 649 San Jose Ave., Contract Compliance Representative
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Malcolm S.M. Watts, 270 Seacliff Ave., Physician

GEORGE DYKSTRA

My address is 949 Filbert Street
My occupation is Community Services Director
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am trained in government finance and Citizen Participation decision making. Long community involvement includes director, Educational Services, Executive Board of Golden Gate Child Development, Saint Mary’s Hospital Board and Yick Wo Elementary Parent’s Committee. My education includes a B.A., emphasizing Education and U.S.C. graduate school.

I am practical, experienced and positive. I expect more from students, parents and teachers. I promise fiscal responsibility. I respect and support parent participation, teacher professionalism and every student’s right to learn in well-equipped, orderly schools. Opportunity, Technology and Basics.

Vote for me! I will keep children in the picture.

George Dykstra

The sponsors for George Dykstra are:

Lisa Bardaro, M.D., 880 Sloat Blvd., Physician
Millicent E. Buxton, 80 Parnassus Ave., Educator
Robert T. Corrado, 18 Miramar Ave., Administrator
Teresa M. D’Auray, 75 Heather St., Environmental Fund Raising
Kathleen DePoela, 949 Filbert St., Psychologist
Kathleen Dykstra, 949 Filbert St., Legal Administrator
Linda J. Gaudreau, 858-26th Ave., Director of Medical Records
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Attorney-at-Law
Ann K. Howell-Ismo, 904 Cortland Ave., Volunteer Coordinator
D. S. Inaba, 44 Escondido Ave., Associate Professor
Martha Anne Jessup, 2362 Diamond St., Educator
Deborah L. Keller, 1466-41 Ave., Student
Katherine Lambert, 63 Winfield St., Women’s Services Consultant
Mim Landry, 1040 Cole St., Student
Nick Lederer, 79 Miraph St., Executive Director, Senior Services
Dr. Thomas S. McCoy, 1446 Clay St., Professor
Tim P. Mass, M.D.55 Lundby’s Ln., AIDS Clinic-Researcher
Susan L. Mok, 1332-38th Ave., Acupuncturist
Marcia Quackenbush, 1699-27th Ave., Social Worker
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director
CAHEED

Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Director of Health
Kenneth M. Sims, 1454 Palou Ave., Associate Director Child Development Center
David E. Smith, 80 Parnassus Ave., Physician
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Montecito St., Attorney
Michael Stepanian, 2109 Baker St., Attorney
Harvey W. Q. Tse, 70 Lomita Ave., Businessman
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilbertas, Methodist Minister
E. Leif Zorkin, 1326-26th Ave., Editor

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

My address is 665 Pine Street
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant
My qualifications for office are: Twelve years of community and civic service.

Issues
Eng supports:
• Our children's inherent right for education.
• Regain respect for our teachers.
• Strict measures to halt school violence. Stop the sale and use of street drugs.
• Higher standards for teachers and students.
• Encourage teachers and parents participation within the Board.
• Merit pay to outstanding teachers.
Maximize income: Lease surplus school properties. End mismanagement by incompetent Board members.
Eng opposes:
• Current programs teaching alternative lifestyle to our precious children. A violation of the First Amendment.
• Board members extravagant dinner meetings with liquor paid for by taxpayers. A blatant violation of the law.

Martin Eng

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:
John Barger, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Real Estate Broker, Former Supervisor
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Commissioner, Contractors State License Board, State of California
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor, Former Supervisor
Dr. John B. Tsu, 2 Denston Dr., Education Commissioner
Melvin M. Bell, 2520 Broadway, Lawyer
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Landmark Preservation Board
Steven J. Doll, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
C. Mackey E. Salazar, 183 San Benito Way, City Planning Commissioner
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli St., Retired
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, State Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Robert Silverst, 3900-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Anna Kyle Pauswang, 30 Cunningham Pl., Legal Assistant
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Vice President, District One Political Action
Kevin G. Molinar, 2247-26th Ave., Property Consultant
John S. Tang, M.D. 2184 Funston Ave., Physician
Timothy A. Tosta, 670 Ashbury St., Attorney
Jung Roy Gee, 665 Pine St., Investor, Education Researcher
William Bernstein, 1000 Franklin St., Attorney
Robert P. Varn, 10 Miller Pl., Chairman-Police Data Systems
Frank S. Yee, 338 Los Palmos Dr., Real Estate Finance; Teacher
Rev. Charles A. McElhenny, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
William Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney at Law
F. Theodore Kitt, 2801 Broadway, Lawyer
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis Ter., V.P.-Branch Manager, S & L
Velma Pettersilie, 665 Pine St., Teacher
Ed Fond, 16-38th Ave., Insurance broker/Accountant
S.M. Saroyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Business Enterprises/Lawyer
Frank N. Alloto, 2801 Vallejo St., Restaurant Owner
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., 444 Coret Ave., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Assn.

EUGENE S. HOPP, M.D.

My address is 601 Van Ness Avenue, Opera Plaza
My occupation is Physician
My qualifications for office are: For the past thirteen years I have served on the Board of Education as an independent voice committed to the goal of educating all our children to their fullest potential. The current stress on teaching the basics must continue, combined with offerings of high technology and vocational courses designed to prepare our diverse student population for a changing future. I stand for an integrated educational program and welcome parents and the public to assist me in this challenge.

Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Eugene S. Hopp are:
Molly M. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Telecommunications Executive
Dianne Feinstein, 3020 Lyon St., Mayor
Joseph L. Alloto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Attorney
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sedonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, Vice President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orinza Ave., Police Commissioner
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Police Commissioner
Alan S. Wong 1280 Ellis St., Commissioner, Community College
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member S F Community College
John F. Crowley, 87 Los Palmos Dr., Labor Official
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Amos J. Castro, 1401 California St., Physician
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Civil Rights Administrator
Harry Polland, 637 Powell St., Economist
Saul Madfis, 75 Country Club Dr., Retired, School Admin.
Jo Birnbam, 1750 Taylor St., Housewife
Anita H. Sanchez, 44 Restani Way, Social Worker
Chadwick C. Ertola, 660 Greenwich St., Attorneys
Naomi Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Businesswoman
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
Rae G Richardson, 1714 Fillmore St., Assoc. Professor
Max L. Christensen, 2 Heathen Ave., Clergymen
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave., Asst Business Mgr
Leo J. Murphy, Sr., 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Lane E. De Lara, 2 Lenox Way, Educational Consultant
Gregory C. Lintner, 2660 Webster St., Realtor
Candidates for School Board

TERRY HUGUNIN

My address is 1824 Noriega Street
My occupation is Consultant
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: Those of us who were teenagers during President Kennedy's Apollo Space Program thought there was nothing we and our nation might not accomplish: "We're going to the moon in ten years!" Thanks to outfits like the National Education Association, the science oriented New Frontiers of the 60's have given way to the "other-directedness" of the Aquarian Age. Their goal: form a society of androgynous pacifists—study their literature. Mine is to restore the problem-solving orientation appropriate to Judeo-Christian culture. Help me mobilize our schools to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative and overcome the nuclear war threat.

Terry Hugunin

JAMES LEGARE

My address is 254 Oak Street
My occupation is Motor Truck Operator
My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I am committed to installing a sound educational program in our schools as the basis for getting our country and economy moving again—in the American tradition. We need to develop young minds through a program of classical education and to protect them by wiping out drugs in the schools and in the nation.

I propose to reform the school system along these lines:

1) Classical geometry and physics, as typified by Plato, Archimedes, Cusa Kepler, and Leibniz

2) Classical poetry, music, and drama, exemplified by Homer, Aeschylus, Dante, Shakespeare, Schiller, Bach, and Beethoven.

James Legare

The sponsors for Terry Hugunin are:

Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Polson St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortilift Operator
Michael Frijio, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elonora Hardy, 143 Farallon St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Leccano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Raiston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

The sponsors for James Legare are:

Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Polson St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortilift Operator
Michael Frijio, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elonora Hardy, 143 Farallon St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
Micaela M. Leccano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Raiston St., Foster Mother
Nick Pace, 130 Campbell Ave., Railroad Employee
Sandra Parks, 16 Garces St., Railroad Employee
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
Nicholas E. Vallejo, 875 Cayuga Ave., Electrician
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JO ANNE MILLER
My address is 1920 Quint Street
My occupation is Parent and Teacher
My qualifications for office are: I am the mother of two children in San Francisco Public Schools. I believe in the Public School System, and have a personal interest in its quality and effectiveness. I am a teacher of the blind. I am President of the Glen Park School Site Advisory Committee, and hold other elected civic offices.

The lack of parent representation on the School Board has contributed to a lack of parent and citizen involvement, a lack of long-term planning and vision in school administration, and a failure to commit the School District to a plan and goal of excellence for all children.

JoAnne Miller

The sponsors for JoAnne Miller are:
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 8th St., Member of Congress
Angel D. Contreras, 1461 Alabama St., Administrator of Headstart
Catherine J. Dodd, 51 Dening St., President, San Francisco NOW
Linda Friis, 830-35th Ave., Community Organizer
Bob Geary, 2578 Great Highway, San Francisco Police Officer
Louise Harvey, 673 Fulton St., Educational Consultant
Marilee Hearns, 3030 Turk Blvd., Teacher
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney Investigator
Daro Inouye, 251 Gates St., Attorney
Clev Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Assistant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir., ILWU
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Jean E. Korrum, 80 Mereed Ave., Environmentalist
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Bill Maher, 69 Elese St., Member of Board of Supervisors
Peter Mezey, 3362 Clay St., Business Executive
Hugh B. Miller, 355 Roosevelt Way, Attorney
John L. Molinari, 30-15th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
James E. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Taxi Cab Owner
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 758 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director, CAHEED, Inc.
Jerry Ringerman, 485 Crestmont Dr., Executive Director, San Francisco Jewish Community Center
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator
A. John Shinnmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., President, AAPUM

BEN TOM
My address is 1717 Jones Street
My occupation is Transportation Analyst
My qualifications for office are: I believe I have provided outstanding leadership during my eight years on the San Francisco Board of Education. This is evidenced by the fact that test scores have improved and new programs have attracted students back from private schools.

As an active parent, I know San Francisco's schools first-hand. I have worked conscientiously for our children's future. I have the vision and I have gained the practical skills necessary to continue building our school district into one of the best large urban districts in the nation.

Benjamin Tom

The sponsors for Ben Tom are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Wendy Nelder, 150 Castit Ave., Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Supervisor, San Francisco
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commission
William K. Coblentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director, CYO
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Jess T. Esteva, 5288 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Ben L. Hom, 1 Villa Ter., Banker, Executive
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker, Community College Board Member
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director, Pre-Trial Diversion Project
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor, City and County
Sala Burton, 8 8th St., Member of Congress
Bill Maher, 69 Elese St., Supervisor
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Myra G. Kroph, 1940-12th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunardo way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Rosario Anaia, 240 Dolores St., Board Member School Administrator
Arto Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Business Representative
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembleyman, 16th District

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ERNEST "CHUCK" AYALA
My address is 4402-20th Street
My occupation is Youth Director, CYO-Urban Development Division
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan, South of Market neighborhood. Attended public and parochial schools, including City and Lone Mountain Colleges. My involvement in community development and public service is with youth in Education, Employment and Delinquency Prevention, in addition to developing and administering Senior Citizens and Veterans Programs. Business management background in labor, insurance and real estate provides me with a balanced approach to fiscal and administrative objectives of the Community College District. My continued goal for the Community College District is to retain its open door policy and remain responsive to the educational and vocational needs of the people.

Ernest Chuck Ayala

The sponsors for Ernest “Chuck” Ayala are:
Reginald Y. Alexander, 182 Middlefield Dr., Vice Chancellor, Certificated
Bernice E. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Homemaker
Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College District
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, S.F. Community College Board
Vincent J. Callan, 4039 19th St., Retired
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot St., House Wife
Marjorie M Colvin, 1835 Franklin St. #1403, Housewife
Peter J. Fatouh, 30 Grand View Ave., Businessman
William L. Fazio, 110 Inverness Dr., Asst District Attorney
Herman Gallegos, 149 Riley St., Management Consultant
Al Graf, 859 Bryant St., Businessman
Thomas F. Haynes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Marcel Kapulica, 2470 22nd Ave., Dental Laboratory-Owner
Louis E. Lagger, 4001 21st St., District Manager, Packing Co.
Dorothy J. Lhubetich, 15 Floristne St., Retired
Ernestine A. McGoldrick, 4442 20th St., School Clerk/Housewife
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., 1789 Eucalyptus St., State Assemblyman
Retired
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Susan Ann Roudalas, 340 A Taraval St., Florist
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., President, S.F. Police Commission
Bob (Robert) Schmidt, 4048 21st St., Librarian
Thomnatra N. Scott, 1912-½ Broderick St., Youth Program Coordinator
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba St., Educator/Police Commissioner
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Bernard J. Ward, 3300 Kirkham St., Atty at law
Bill Zorizakis, 543 Castro St., Shoe Repairer

AMOS CLEOPHILUS BROWN
My address is 111 Lunado Way
My occupation is Clergyman
My age is 43
My qualifications for office are: I hold the B.A., M.Div. and D.D. degrees. 16 years of public service on boards of education throughout the U.S. more than qualifies me for the position.
My services on the Board of Governors since 1982 reflect that I am competent and able to work with a team of governors to ensure the delivery of a quality education system for all persons in our community who desire training for marketable skills. Community College also must serve the needs of those who for various reasons have not had the opportunity of going to other institutions of higher learning for training.

Amos C. Brown

The sponsors for Amos C. Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Member, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, Community College Board
Priscilla A. Denny, 210 Broderick St., Secretary
James Gordon Emerson, Jr., 175 Beaumont St., Clergyman
Mayor Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Zelma R. Harrison, 1957 Hayes St., Bookkeeper
Richard D. Honigster, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Grandvel A. Jackson, 57 Kensington Way, Retired
Clifton R. Jeffers, 1835 14th Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor
John L. Molinar, 30 16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Lauraret Newkirk, 554 Brussels St., System Support Librarian
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Naomi Shines, 756 Page St., Fiscal Clerk
Rabbi Solomon M. Saper, 1059 Clement St., Rabbi
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas St., Minister
Hannah A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergyman
Tomothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, President, College Board
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PATRICK C. FITZGERALD

My address is 128 Detroit Street
My occupation is San Francisco County Central Committeeman, 16th Assembly District.
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: • Am married, father of three children and a homeowner
     • Graduated: St. Ignatius College Prep. and City College of San Francisco
     • Elected San Francisco County Central Committeeman (since 1970)
     • California State Central Committeeman (since 1978)
     • Attended San Francisco 1984 National Presidential Convention for Mondale-Ferrero
     • Served on San Francisco City Government CATV Task Force Educational Access Committee
     • Instrumental in adoption of San Francisco City College Labor Studies Program
     • Great Nephew of former San Francisco County Supervisor Tom O'Dowd
     • Past Secretary San Francisco County Central Committee
     • Strong opponent 1983 Feinstein Recall
     • Successfully fought peripheral canal
     • Support Propositions: 33 (disabled homeowners) and 40 (political campaign reform).

Patrick C. Fitzgerald

The sponsors for Patrick C. Fitzgerald are:

Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hast Ave., Labor Union Official
John J. Moyo, 2985-24th Ave., Labor Leader
Terence Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Marion L. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Social Worker
Patricia K. Mooser, 1762-17th Ave., Tax Consultant/Bookkeeper
Josephine Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman
Cheri Stein, 2330 Slot Blvd., Cashier
Brian J. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Real Estate Broker
Sue T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., State Central Committeewoman
Mildred K. Bird, 1762-17th Ave., Retired
Mary Ann Cowen, 134 Detroit St., Secretary
Charles T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Retired
Emily H. Shimmon, 19 Middlefield St., Housewife
Thomas P. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Displayman
Esther F. Zlot, 75 Middlefield St., Retired
Peter B. Paragas, 1923 San Jose Ave., Engineering Graduate
Robert Silvestri, 3000-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Adriano Biagio, 131 Detroit St., Retired
A. Lee Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, City College Graduate
Kenneth J. Lukas, 215 Detroit St., Carpenter
Lloyd A. Ouan, 96 Staples St., Retired
Louise E. Quin, 96 Staples St., Retired
William T. Bray, 207 San Juan Ave., Gateman
Mary B. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Housewife
Lisa L. Klobuchar, 135 San Felipe Way, County Central Committeewoman
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
Jim Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Ato H. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney

DEAN GOODMAN

My address is 825 Geary Street #703
My occupation is Retired Teacher/Actor
My age is 64

My qualifications for office are: Thirty years of teaching, an educator's concern for quality instruction, and a citizen's awareness of the need for budget control. As the first fulltime president of the Community College Federation of Teachers, Local 2121 and as a former staff member of the District I know well the policies and procedures which form the structure of the Community College and the College Centers.

If elected, I will insist on fair hiring practices, and as a member of that most diverse of all groups, our Senior Citizens, I will support college services for all adults regardless of individual differences.

Dean Goodman

The sponsors for Dean Goodman are:

Priscilla Alden, 1677 Bush St., #8, Actress
Ugo Baldassari, 988 Dolores St., Theatre Director
James E. Ballard, 2 Arbor St., Teacher
Sheldon I Balman, 5 Peregro Ter., Attorney
Laurent R. Broussal, 855 Quintara St., Administrator, Community College
Kimo Cochran, 1330 Bush St., Bar Owner
Donald G. Climent, 119 Ord St., Refugee Resettlement Counselor
Lauri Fried-Lee, 435 19th Ave., Community College Instructor
William Gundel, 1415 Franklin St., Credit Adjuster
Frances T. Hughes, 2649 Polk St., Legal Secretary
Donna Ilyia, 76 6th Ave., Counselor
Lynda Bergens Kahl, 24 Magnolia St., Singer/Actress
Michael J. Mandel, 12 Marne St., Attorney
Donnald J. Miller, 26 Leo St., Furniture Manufacturer
Jay Moran, 1607 Page St., Business Representative
Alfred Nomura, 177 Ocean St., Theatrical Photographer
Judy Winn-Bell Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Teacher/Author/Editor
Roger E. W-B Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Publisher
Frank Reilly, 3415 Divisadero St., Advertising/Actor
James J. Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Rev. James E. Sandmire, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
Eve Stoddard, 180 Diamond St., Probate Administration
Daniel A. Sullivan, 1590 Sacramento St., Attorney
Doug Trantham, 201 Taylor St., Banker
Sigrid Wunschmidt, 1142 DeHaro St., Actress
Samuel L. Zanze, 2581 25th Ave., Businessman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ANDRE F. PEHARGOU
My address is 3840 Fulton Street
My occupation is Civil Servant
My qualifications for office are: I have been a resident of San Francisco for 34 years. I am a graduate of California State University San Francisco; San Francisco City College, and Lowell High School.
Most taxpayers are not benefiting from the Community College System due to lack of information and lack of convenient locations.
As a Board member, I will advocate a strong academic curriculum; More neighborhood locations to facilitate Senior citizens and working taxpayers; Better utilization of present facilities, and a decrease in tuition fees for City residents.
If you want expanded services to help benefit you, give me your support on election day.

Andre F. Pehargou
The sponsors for Adre F. Pehargou are:
William Angelopoulou, 59 Prague St., Employed
Renée Boulay, 605 Arguello Blvd., Retired
Josephine Bucchiotti, 353 25th Ave., Retired
Andre Carrey, 487 2nd Ave., Retired
James Edward Coleman, 620 Banks St., Supervisor
Alice Crowe, 1827 Balboa St., Part Time Office Worker
Robert S. Flahavan, 151 Buchanan St., Operations Officer, S. F. Airport
Emma Garrigues, 2702 Anza St., Retired
Diana Hantman, 361 25th Ave., Teacher
Rose Hantman, 720 La Playa St., #307, Retired
Paulette Henderson, 798 Naples St., Retired
Paul Keplinger, 3832 Fulton St., Conicerge
Anna Kono, 3315 Irving St., Retired
James Courtney Kovach, 1202 43rd Ave., Lithographer
Eva Lim, 3832 Fulton St., Asst. Paymistress
D. Martin, 87 Seward St., Supervisor

JULIE TANG
My address is 788-18th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor's degree in Psychology from the University of San Francisco; Master's in Education from Stanford University; Juris Doctorate from Hastings College of Law; a wife, mother, former teacher and counselor; and presently, Assistant District Attorney in San Francisco.
I have served diligently, always conscious of my responsibility to all the communities of San Francisco who gave me the highest number of votes four years ago. I strive to ensure that the Community College will continue providing quality education to all students, even during financial crises, without sacrificing student or faculty needs. As the only woman board member, I actively support women's issues.

Julie Tang
The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
John Yehall Chinn, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Brett, 783-A Guerrero St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member Board of Supervisors
Yori Wada, 505-4th Ave., Univ of Calif Regent
John L. Molinar, 30-16th Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Commissioner, Board of Education/School Administrator
Arlo E. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant SF Sheriff's Dept.
Amos C. Brown, 11 Lanudo Way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member SF Community College Board
Madeleine H. Russell, 3778 Washington St., Investments
Susan J. Berman, 1529 Shadrer St., Planning Commissioner
Agrapino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Director
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member SF Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Community Activist
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Incumbent SF Supervisor
Bette W. Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney's Investigator
Jeffrey K. Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 910 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer/Worker, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

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

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

Moy Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy Velasquez are:
Lillian Aldia, 231 Granada Ave., Teacher
Conception G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Teacher
Melandro Busto, 49 Capp St., Student
Victoriano G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Mechanic
Stasia Cagar, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Sales
Rosita T. Castaneda, 18 Guy Pl., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion P. Crespedes, 931 Prague St., Teacher
Cheryl R. Conrad, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student
Theresa N. Fabro, 4186 Mission St., School Lunchroom Manager
Kenneth A. Guerra, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Technician
Odella Jones, 1775 Newcomb Ave., Housekeeper
Felicia M. Misenas, 266 Brighton Ave., School Lunch Helper
Basil C. Nickerson, 336-6th St., Self Employed
Willie B. Nicholas, 1231-5th Ave., Custodian
Jack Lee Nenawash, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Production Manager
Margaret M. Powers, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Customer Service
Clarice D. Robinson, 2445 Harrison St., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion A. Ramos, 2700 Folsom St., Room Cleaner
Murdie Washington, 195 Highland St., Monitor
David A. Woodard, 397 Green St., Chef

DR. TIM WOLFRED

My address is 91 Sanchez Street
My occupation is Incumbent, President, San Francisco Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: As an incumbent, I am proud of a College Board that, with less dollars than it had four years ago, has kept all programs operating and has expanded services to San Franciscans most dependent on a healthy community college system for access to job skills training and a basic college education. Neighborhood college centers have moved into larger, renovated facilities. Vocational offerings in fields like computer technologies, nursing, and auto mechanics have been updated. Classes in language skills have been strengthened in immigrant communities. We are a Board dedicated to quality education open to all San Franciscans.

Dr. Tim Wolfred

The sponsors for Dr. Tim Wolfred are:
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
Willie Brown, 1200 Gough St., Assembly Member
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembly Member
Azlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff, City and County of San Francisco
Doris Ward, 440 Davis St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Bill Maher, 69 Eise St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wille B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Brit, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Alan Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Julie Ting, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Member, Community College Board
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Sedonia Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., School Board Member
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member
Ariago R. Carballos, 471 Hoffman Ave, School Board Member
Carlota T. del Portillo, 64 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner

Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Harold Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilberta St., Pastor, Glide Church
Bob Ross, 4000-20th St., Publisher
Sandy Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Thomas Peretti, 378-16th St., Banker
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Sal Roselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Official
Carole Migden, 563-28th St., Executive Director, Operation Concern
Port Revenue Bonds

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

YES 253

NO 254

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Port Commission operates the Port of San Francisco. When funds are needed for Port construction or improvements, the Commission may issue revenue bonds to raise funds. A majority of the voters must approve these bonds before they can be issued. The revenue bonds are then paid from Port revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance several improvements of Port property. These improvements include modernizing container handling facilities, upgrading various piers, constructing a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, and renovating certain other Port structures and property. The bonds would then be paid off from Port revenues.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance improvements of Port property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Port Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

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

- Bond redemption: $42,500,000
- Bond interest: $81,761,400
- Total debt service requirement: $124,261,400

"Based on a three year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning four years after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $4,462,000 to a maximum of $5,760,000 annually for twenty-seven years.

"In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Port revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Port sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Port. Analysis of projected resources available to the Port indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On July 30 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on a motion placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 51.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The revitalization of the Port of San Francisco will bring new jobs and new tax revenue to the City. A healthy port, with increased ship traffic, will bring millions each year to the San Francisco economy.

By delaying modernizations in the past, the Port of San Francisco lost the bulk of its maritime business to other Bay Area and West Coast cities. The same mistakes must not be made twice. We must allow the Port to use revenues to finance continued improvements.

Proposition A does not authorize any new taxes. Proposition A simply authorizes the Port to use revenues to finance improvements and expansion.

Proposition A will allow for the modernization of existing container cargo terminals on the southern waterfront. These improved facilities will retain current business and will bring new lines to San Francisco. The return of the shipping business will bring back long lost blue collar jobs to the waterfront as well as white collar jobs.

In addition, Proposition A will provide for expansion of the passenger facility, a new breakwater to protect the commercial fishing fleet, and improved rail access to the port. In all, Proposition A will upgrade and modernize San Francisco Port facilities so as to make them competitive with other ports across the Bay and throughout the West Coast.

The complete modernization effort will be done at no cost to the taxpayers. Instead, the Port of San Francisco’s income will be used to finance long-term revenue bonds. The people of San Francisco deserve a first-rate port. We urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote YES on Proposition A.

As Mayor, I have worked hard to restore our port to its historic pre-eminence as a major gateway to the Far East.

Once again, major shipping lines are docking in San Francisco. Just recently, two of the largest container vessel operators, China Ocean Shipping Corporation and Columbus Lines, signed agreements to use this port.

Not only modern cargo carriers, but passenger liners as well are being drawn to San Francisco in a remarkable renaissance of maritime commerce.

But if there is to be a lasting renewal of our waterfront, the port must be competitive with other port cities anxiously contending for the burgeoning Pacific trade. The port, if it is to prosper, must modernize and enlarge its basic maritime facilities.

That’s the purpose of Proposition A.

Proposition A will make the Port of San Francisco truly and vigorously competitive. And it will not cost the taxpayers a penny.

Proposition A will authorize $42.5 million in revenue bonds for vital waterfront projects, including the conversion of Pier 80 into a modern, state-of-the-art container facility and the enlargement and modernization of cargo operations at Piers 94 and 96.

Additionally, Proposition A will provide funds for repairing the now deteriorating Jefferson Street Seawall and will match Federal dollars for construction of a much-needed breakwater to protect the City’s fishing fleet at Fisherman’s Wharf.

Proposition A also will finance expansion of the passenger terminal at Pier 35.

Proposition A is a prudent investment in the City’s future. And these bonds are payable only from port revenues—your taxes will not be increased.

More ships, with more cargo and more passengers, mean more jobs and greater economic vitality for our city.

Proposition A will make our port, once again, a strong and lasting competitor for the commerce of the Pacific Basin. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco needs a good, working port. Vote yes on Proposition A and help bring it about.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Citizens of San Francisco are worried about the deterioration of the port. Most of us can remember when the port was a thriving, bustling commercial enterprise, and the docks were maintained, clean, efficient, and busy.

But, the port has not adapted to container cargo, and may be losing the few shipping lines that it now serves.

We must restructure the docks for active container shipping, and bring in railway lines to service the docks.

We have one of the few deep water ports in America, an essential for modern shipping. LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT BEING ONE OF THE BEST PORTS IN THE WEST AGAIN!

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Wendy Nelder
President of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will permit the Port of San Francisco to issue bonds to finance needed construction and improvements. This would give the Port the same financing ability the Airport now has.

Through the issuance of revenue bonds, the Port would be able to undertake necessary improvements AT NO COST TO TAXPAYERS.

San Francisco deserves a modern, thriving port. Proposition A will help us build modern terminals, a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf which will help keep commercial fishermen in San Francisco, repair the seawall at Jefferson Street and expand our Passenger Terminal to handle increased cruise business that brings millions of dollars into our local economy.

Proposition A will give the Port of San Francisco the ability to make these kinds of improvements. Please join me in voting YES.

Sala Burton,
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A offers San Franciscans the opportunity to direct the future of the Port of San Francisco.

This measure will provide our Port with the key to the future.

We must keep pace with new developments, increase cargo and create new jobs. For every fifty new containers we move, 1.67 new jobs will be created.

This measure also includes funding for construction of the Fisherman's Wharf Breakwater, which is critically needed and long overdue.

Take part in the future of our Port. Join with me in voting YES on Proposition A.

Milton Marks,
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a waterfront city. We have a superb natural harbor, which is also one of the few really deep water harbors—vital for modern deep water cargo ships.

We have used our badly deteriorating and long unimproved pier facilities to their maximum efficiency. But times are changing. We must move NOW to keep pace with new developments, or risk enormous losses in cargo shipping, commercial fishing, and tourist trade.

It is ESSENTIAL that we adapt to container cargo that can be moved by train, truck, and ship.

Research has been done on what could give us the greatest increase in efficiency and profits for the very least amount of money. And the answer is: modernizing the South Terminal for adaptation to container cargo; providing rail access to the docks; protecting the commercial fishing fleet with a breakwater; and expanding passenger-handling facilities for cruise passenger tourists.

Prop A will provide these improvements RIGHT NOW. And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION
Arthur H. Coleman, President
James Rudden, Vice President
Gordon Lau, Member
Anne Halsted, Member
James Herman, Member

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

Fisherman’s Wharf is a valued segment of the community and needs your help to ensure its economic well-being.

A YES vote on Proposition A will provide the needed financing to build the long awaited breakwater to ensure the safety of our commercial fishing fleet, create new berths and new jobs.

A YES vote on Proposition A will repair the Jefferson Street Seawall before it becomes a dangerous hazard to our visitors and to our community.

A YES vote will insure the economic vitality of Fisherman’s Wharf as well as the entire San Francisco Waterfront.

Join with us and vote YES.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Louis Ferrari, President
Crab Boat Owner’s Association

Christopher Martin
President, Fisherman’s Wharf Merchant Assoc.
Fritz Arko
Alessandro Baccari
Ex. Secretary, Fisherman’s Wharf Merchant Assoc.
L. B. Barnes
Fisherman’s Wharf Seafood
Phil Bentivegna
Fishing Boat Butchie B
Bob Bugato
California Shell Fish Co.
Ken Burger
Franciscan Restaurant
Pat Flanagan
Standard Fisheries
Anthony Casali
Fishing Boat Norene

Virgil P. Caselli, Native
S. Joseph Cincotta
F. Alioto Fish Co.
Nick D’Amato
Fishing Boat Nicky D
Nino Geraldi
Tom Lazio
Tom Lazio Fish Co.
Andrew Lolli
William McDonnell
Albert Spadaro
Sports Fishing Boat
New Flories
Mario J. Alioto
Calif. Seafood Institute
Peter Brown
The Anchorage

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The opportunity is NOW!

Our Northern Waterfront is alive with activity—increase in passengers ships, thriving commercial developments.

Let us fuse that energy into our Southern Waterfront and take advantage of our natural deep water. That means newer, deeper draft merchant ships, increased cargoes and new jobs.

Missed opportunities cannot be recaptured. So act now! Don’t let this opportunity get away.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Sec/Treasurer San Francisco Labor Council
Le Roy King
Regional Director ILWU
Tim Twomey, President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trade Council
Chuck Mack, President
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our waterfront is an outstandingly beautiful and profitable aspect of San Francisco. The port has been badly neglected, however. We need to VOTE YES ON PROP A to improve and rebuild cargo and passenger facilities.

PROP A will guarantee increased maritime activities, new jobs, the revival of our fishing industry, and the safety of shoreline areas.

And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!

For our neighborhood, and for our City, VOTE YES ON PROP A!

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors

Phyllis Kern
Golden Gate Democratic Club* Open Space Committee*
Jim Wachob
District 8 Democratic Club*
Kevin Malone
District 8 Democratic Club*
Bette Landis
Democratic Women’s Forum*
Rebecca Evans
Sierra Club*
Beverly Karnatz
Committee for Better Parks
and Recreation in Chinatown*

Richard Livingston
Adria Garabedian
Andrea Jepson
Madrid Hamilton
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Wallinda McCreas
Douglas Engmann
Dale Carlson
Stafford Buckley
Dick Pabich
Ron Huberman

*for identification purposes only
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a great port city. And the San Francisco Port has always been a leading employer of minorities.

But the Port has sadly deteriorated. It has not kept up with modernizations and improvements. And what is even worse, it has not kept up with the competition. The Port MUST adapt to container cargo, and put in railway access to the docks. With your vote YES ON A, we can take advantage of our deep water harbor, attract more shipping trade, increase cargoes, and produce many more jobs.

And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!
VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Naomi Gray
Doris Thomas
Mabel Schine
Linda Dickens

J. E. Thomas
A. Brooks
Frankie Gillette
Lois DeCayette
Joel DeCayette
Jule Anderson
Altheda Carrie
George Newkirk
Elouise Westbrook
Shirley Jones
Clifton Jeffers
Joe Williams
Carol Belle
Benjamin James
Grandvel Jackson
Amos Brown
Faye Anderson
Zuretti Goosby
Stan Palomas-Criollo
Jene Rita Alviar
Ernest C. Ayala
Alan S. Wong
Stan Moy
Douglas S. Chan
Thomas Hsieh
Alicia Wang
Ben Tom
Pius Lee
Julie Tang
Louis Hop Lee
Dennis Wong
Melvin Dong Lee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our Port now needs $42 million to develop San Francisco's maritime facilities to compete with ports such as Oakland, Seattle and San Diego.

These improved facilities are vital to San Francisco's competition for jobs and trade for the Pacific. Currently all major west coast ports are building to meet the growing needs of America's Pacific Trade. These ports have each spent an average of $57 million on recent container cargo expansion while San Francisco has spent nothing.

San Francisco must have at least comparable facilities in order to compete in this market. If the port is not developed for container cargo, San Francisco can forget about being a major port on the west coast as well as lose the jobs and revenue that a modern port could produce.

The Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that you vote to bring San Francisco the jobs and business that will be created by these revenue bonds. The bonds will be paid off from Port revenue and there is no taxpayer risk.

If you want to see the Port continue to grow and prosper vote yes on Proposition A.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reconstruct municipal harbor facilities!!!:

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

Juanita G. Raven
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committeeman
Bob Geary
Democratic County Committeeman
Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Martin Eng

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

When something is railroaded through City Hall on a “fast track”, it is always difficult not to join the stampede. This, however, is a bond issue in an amount larger than necessary to perform the actual work contemplated; not backed by written leases; and not backed even by “letter agreements” with corporations which supposedly will use Piers 80, 94 and 96 if improvements are made. This bond issue was rushed through the Board of Supervisors. Transmitted to the Board on July 24th, a scant six days later (on July 30th) and without a specific noticed public hearing, the Board voted 7-1 to place it on the ballot. I dissented because more time was needed for a proper analysis and public input.

Presently, the Port has a debt service requirement of approximately $104,000,000.00. This proposed revenue bond issue would increase the debt service requirement to $228,261,400.00; a staggering rise. The $42,500,000.00 bond issue would produce but $40,202,000.00 in net proceeds. The Port has a surplus of about $19,000,000.00, of which approximately $15,000,000.00 is available for capital projects. The Controller says $49,254,660.00, would thus be available for capital projects costing $41,610,000.00.

The Port is borrowing $7,644,660.00 more than is needed for these seven capital projects. Why? The Port admits it has no long-term written commitments for Piers 80, 94 and 96 which account for $37,570,000.00 of the total bond issue. How can we be assured that the bondholders will be repaid by revenues from those piers if there are no long-term commitments?

Moreover, the Port hasn’t even secured written “letter agreements” from corporations to assure that if those improvements are made, they will sign long-term commitments. Ironically, but $4,000,000.00 of the bond issue would be spent on needed improvements for Fisherman’s Wharf tenants, who generate almost 50% of net Port income, money which would be used to repay the money borrowed for Piers 80, 94 and 96. It’s like the tail wagging the dog.

Selling bonds is nothing more than borrowing money. Why borrow more money than you have to, and why borrow money for projects which don’t have long-term tenants? Be assured that even if this passes, I intend to persist in making Port officials answer those very questions.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

MOTION AUTHORIZING
PROPOSITION A

MOTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A MEASURE AUTHORIZING THE PORT COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS TO FINANCE THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION OF CERTAIN PORT FACILITIES TO BE LOCATED AT THE PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby orders submitted to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 6, 1984 a measure authorizing the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to issue revenue bonds, all as set forth in the following measure, to wit:

Shall the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $42,500,000 the proceeds of which will be used to modernize container handling facilities and to upgrade various other mariti-time-oriented facilities at the Port of San Francisco’s piers 35, 80, 94 and 96 and at the Jefferson Street seawall, to construct a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, to construct an intermodal container transfer facility, to install a backflow prevention system at various locations, to replace various transformers and capacitors throughout the port, and to acquire, construct or renovate certain works, property or structures necessary or convenient for the operation of, and at, the Port of San Francisco, which facilities are operated by the Port Commission?
Water Revenue Bonds

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

YES 256

NO 257

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission operates the San Francisco Water Department. When the Commission needs funds to acquire, improve or develop Water Department facilities, it may issue revenue bonds to raise the funds. Before the Commission can issue revenue bonds, a majority of the voters must approve. The revenue bonds are then paid from Water Department revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds. Funds from the sale of the bonds would be used to acquire, improve or develop facilities necessary for the operation of the Water Department, including filtration plants and reservoirs. The bonds would be paid off from the revenues of the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance Water Department improvements.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Public Utilities Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

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

- Bond redemption: $104,000,000
- Bond interest: $169,260,000
- Total debt service requirement: $273,260,000

“Based on a five year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning one year after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $3,467,000 to a maximum of $14,022,000 annually for thirty-one years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Water Department revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Water Department sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Water Department. Analysis of projected resources available to the Water Department indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on a resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The money from these bonds will be used to assure that drinking water we take from our Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs on the Peninsula is pure and meets all health standards. The bonds will be repaid from revenues of our Water Department. Not a penny will be charged on the property tax rolls or to the general taxpayers.

We have two huge lakes along side I-280 on the Peninsula, the Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs. About 15% of our drinking water in normal times comes from these lakes and others in Alameda County. For decades we used this water without filtration. Now, however, health officials tell us that all of the water from our Peninsula lakes must be filtered before it can be used. We now have a very limited filtering capacity which means that if, for any reason, our water supply from the Sierra were interrupted or reduced and we would need more local water, we would be unable to make full use of Crystal Springs water. There now is no filter plant at Crystal Springs. Whatever water we use from there must be pumped up to a small filtration plant at San Andreas before it can enter the system. This very severely limits the amount of drinking water we can draw from our nearest supply, and it is expensive. Passage of Proposition B would change all that.

By voting YES on B, you will provide for water system improvements including a new filtration plant right at Crystal Springs, for the expansion of the small plant at San Andreas, and for a necessary storage reservoir.

Your YES on B vote is an investment in the quality of our drinking water—an assurance that water from our nearest supply will be available to us pure, meeting all health requirements, when we need it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Generations ago, San Franciscans had the foresight to build one of the most magnificent water systems in the world—Hetch Hetchy, which brings water to San Francisco from the High Sierras.

Now, we must modernize the system to keep pace with higher standards of water quality.

Proposition B will authorize the San Francisco Water Department to issue $104 million in revenue bonds.

The money will be used to improve the system by expanding existing plants and by building additional filtration, treatment and holding facilities on Water Department properties on the Peninsula.

These facilities will provide safe drinking water for future generations of San Franciscans. Presently, if any of the existing facilities suffered a breakdown, the City could be forced to rely upon unfiltered water from Crystal Springs. The State Department of Public Health has directed the Water Department to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Our water is safe. It meets all state and Federal quality standards, and we want to keep it that way. Proposition B will assure low turbidity (silt content), reduce asbestos content, and prevent the spread of giardia lambia, a virus not now found in our water system, but which could be brought in as watershed areas become more populated.

Proposition B, which will not have any effect on our tax structure, is a prudent investment, protecting our drinking water into the future. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote yes on Proposition B and help guarantee us pure, plentiful water.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED
Health Commission

PROPOSITION C

Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?  

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Department of Public Health operates the county hospitals, such as San Francisco General and Laguna Honda, and all other county public health services. The Department is run by a Public Health Director, who is appointed by the City's Chief Administrative Officer and who is responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would create a Health Commission, and place the Department of Public Health under the control of the Commission. The Commission would have seven members, appointed by the Mayor; no more than three members would be doctors, nurses, hospital administrators or other health care professionals. The Commission would appoint a Public Health Director, responsible to the Commission, to administer the Department. The Public Health Director could appoint and remove deputies to help administer the Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of a Health Commission appointed by the Mayor, and to be run by a Public Health Director, appointed by the Health Commission.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of the Chief Administrative Officer and to be run by a Public Health Director appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs of the Health Department, by approximately $8,400 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Public Health Department has a budget of over $270 million and a staff of 5000, making it the largest agency in City government. Its responsibilities are many and far-reaching: San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital; emergency medical services; mental health services; sanitation; public health education; district health centers; inspection of public and private facilities. The list is long and growing.

In recent years, the list of problems facing departmental administrators has, unfortunately, also grown. Emergency Aid stations were closed. Ambulance service was drastically altered. Proposals to reorganize community mental health services were promoted and rejected, causing confusion for all. The AIDS crisis. The investigations at San Francisco General Hospital. And on and on.

Too often, these decisions and these issues were considered in a vacuum, without public input, without public debate, and without public scrutiny.

Why? In order to protect the Department of Public Health from the graft and corruption that plagued our City at the turn of the century, the Charter placed the department under the Chief Administrative Officer's auspices rather than a commission. Fifty years later, the department has outgrown this cumbersome arrangement. It is time to bring the administration of this important agency into the 20th Century, mirroring the management of other City departments.

Proposition C will establish a seven-member Health Commission, appointed by the Mayor, to set policy and supervise the Public Health Department. The commission will include both providers and consumers of health services. It will bring the Department more directly under the Mayor's control, allowing for more timely responses to issues and problems. Most importantly, it will ensure that the department is publicly accountable for its actions.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Public health policy has changed and the governance of our public health department must change too.

In the past few years the state and federal governments have shifted more and more of the responsibility for public health management to local governments.

Recent experience shows that our health department is not presently equipped to manage public health programs in the most effective manner.

Proposition C will streamline management—cutting two levels of bureaucracy while opening up our public health policy to the public itself.

I urge a "yes" vote on Proposition C.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Since 1971, the Department of Public Health has been plagued with problems and crises at its hospitals, clinics and emergency aid stations. Most recently, we again faced the threat of San Francisco General losing its accreditation. These many incidents are deeply disturbing, raising troubling questions in the public mind: Why do these problems persist? Why can't something be done about them once and for all?

In 1979, the national organization that accredits all hospitals reported that San Francisco General's "major problems . . . are related to the lack of an effective governing body free from the political decision-making process which results in delayed activity, inadequate funding, etc." Last January, the State auditors also cited the absence of "a governing body legally responsible for hospital governance" as a cause for "ineffective management."

No other hospital in California operates without a board of directors. Only one other department in San Francisco (Public Works) operates without a commission. Instead, San Francisco General and the Health Department are run by a bureaucracy, insulated from public accountability.

Proposition C establishes a commission for the Health Department, one that will hold public hearing, make public decisions, and be publicly accountable. Vote YES.

Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Supervisor Louise Renne
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
(Continued)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's population is aging. In a few short years, a greater percentage of our citizens will be seniors—most living independently on fixed incomes, many frail and over 75—than those of other California cities. They will need nutritional information, home health care, and a broad range of coordinated social services.

The Department of Health, San Francisco General, Laguna Honda, the District Health Centers—these are critical providers of senior services. And as more and more state and federal programs are shifted to local agencies, the Department’s role and responsibilities will dramatically increase.

How will the Department respond to this increased responsibility? How can we ensure that it will develop policies and programs that meet seniors' needs? And how can we be sure that these programs operate efficiently and effectively?

Proposition C is a big step in the right direction. VOTE YES!

Kathleen Lammers
Abraham Biderman
Jeanette Harris
Larry Bernardini, R.N.
Nancy Boughney, M.S.W.
David Lally, M.S.W.
Ollie Mae Black
Stephen Graham

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is important for women.

Women provide the majority of services offered by the Health Department. Indeed public health is traditionally the domain of women and nurses. And while the many crises at General are too often blamed on nursing care, nurses virtually have no role in planning or organizing service delivery.

Women are also the major consumers of the Depart-
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The policies governing San Francisco General affect every consumer and provider of health services in the City, yet there is little accountability to San Francisco taxpayers. No private hospital with General's size and influence operates without a board of trustees or directors. Indeed, no private organization of any kind with a $270 million annual budget—business, corporation, non-profit foundation, whatever—operates without a governing board. Why does General?

As General bounces from one crisis to the next, with state and federal agencies threatening increasingly drastic actions, the weakness of the current management structure becomes clear to all. The Hospital and the Health Department need a commission, where public hearings can surface problems and issues in a timely fashion; where policies can be developed with the cooperation of private providers and consumers. The Health Commission will not be a watchdog meddling in day-to-day affairs, but an advocate for General, one providing continuity, stability and a rational decision-making process with regular rules and procedures.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Rolland Lowe, M.D.
Past President, San Francisco Medical Society
Robert Aaron, M.D.
Robert Gross, M.D.
Molly Coye, M.D.
Robert Koshikama, D.D.S.
Maureen Katz, M.D.
Yoshio Nakashima, D.D.S.
James Cole, M.D.
John Good, M.D.
Jeff Sandler, M.D.
Judy Keeven, M.D.
Robert Dickter, D.D.S.
Jeffrey Drais, M.D.
Gabriel Escobar, M.D.
Brad Evans, M.D.
Lars Erickson, M.D.
Randy Yanda, M.D.
Stephen Collins, M.D.
Lewis Pepper, M.D.
Mark Smith, M.D.
Donald Goldmacher, M.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is obligated to ensure that all San Francisco communities have access to medical services. The AIDS crisis brought the health care needs of gay men to the forefront of public discussion. It brought home the importance of a Department flexible and responsive to quickly emerging problems and epidemics, one capable of quickly reallocating resources to dire community needs.

The general health needs of gay men and women, however, are largely unrecognized. The Health Commission will give our community the voice it needs in the health planning processes. It will ensure that the diversity of our City is represented in the consideration of these important issues.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli
John Mehring
Del Martin
Donald Cataland
Cleve Jones
Randy Stallings
Ron Huberman
Richard Allman
Jeff Jones
Phyllis Lyon
Debra Friedland
Roberto Esteves

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Hispanics in San Francisco strongly support Proposition C, the Health Commission Charter Amendment.

Health is vital to the Latino Community of San Francisco. We are a younger population, with larger families and with special health needs, such as those of Central American refugees. In recent years, federal and state funding for health programs has decreased, leaving community health programs in a difficult financial situation. Recent changes in Medically Indigent Adult services have also negatively impacted our community.

In addition, the need for better and expanded bilingual medical services continues to be a top priority in San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition C.

Celso Ortiz
Rafael Cedillos
Maria Degado
Robert Hernandez
Joanna Devito-Larson
Rosa Maria Clos
Susan Houston
Arnell Rodrigues
P. Braverman, M.D.
Alfredo Rodrigues
Sonia Melara
Joseph Tanner
Edgar Quiraz
Angel Coutreras
Roger Hernandez
Tom Romero
Raphael Taliuf ferro
Juanaita DelCarlo
Juan Pifarre
Rudolph Mathias
Rolf Hurtdo
Alfredo Rivas
Vilma Mendoza
O. Bracker
Ray Rivera
Lorenzo Dill
Yolanda Camerons
Monica Asturias
**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C**

The chief opposition to Proposition C comes from two sources: The Chief Administrative Officer and the officials of the University of California Medical Center.

The CAO's opposition is understandable. He simply doesn't want to lose control of the Health Department and SF General.

UC's opposition is more puzzling, until you realize that it receives $10-15 million from the City each year for staffing at General Hospital without a publicly reviewed contract! Why is UC afraid of having its relationship with General publicly scrutinized by a Health Commission?

Let's clear the air. Vote YES on Proposition C.

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C**

We support Proposition C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fred Ross</th>
<th>Beatrice Patterson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James O'Connor</td>
<td>Thomas Ambrogi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Carlson</td>
<td>Arlo Hale Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Duffy</td>
<td>Dian Blomquist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Yoachum</td>
<td>Thomas Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.J. Soviero</td>
<td>Peter Hanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalind Wolf</td>
<td>Jack Morrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Brownell</td>
<td>Mary Vail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Wachob</td>
<td>Sally Osaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Krefting</td>
<td>Linda Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoAnne Miller</td>
<td>Terrance Farr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maura Kealey</td>
<td>Ken McDowdoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret O’Driscoll</td>
<td>Sue Hestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicerita Revelo</td>
<td>Willie Gee, D.D.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Holtzclaw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Paul Vacaralli          | Jay Wallace        |
| Al Cassiato             | Rob Waters         |
| Alan Raznick            | Kevin Malone       |
| James Haas              | Jan Holloway       |
| Al Borvice              | Norman Rolfe       |
| Essie Webb              | Tom Jones          |
| Joan Mouton             | Barbara Halliday   |
| Russell Zellers         | Sandra Powell      |
| Stanley Shields         | Deborah Sarvis     |
| Richard Sevilla         | Esther Marks       |
| Ann Daley               | James Augustino    |
| Dorothy Labudde         | Sharon Johnson     |
| Dorice Murphy           | Eileen Adams       |
| Howard Strassner        | Ruth Gravanis      |
| Mark Davalos            | Michael Heffer     |

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C**

Community clinics provide thousands of San Franciscans with access to essential primary health care and preventive health services. Yet, these community-based institutions, as well as the neighborhoods and people they represent, have been excluded from participation in health policy decision-making in San Francisco. Excluded, too, is any public debate on alternatives to hospital-based health delivery and financing systems that could prove cost-effective and could better serve the people of San Francisco.

Proposition C, The Health Commission Charter Amendment, offers a forum for public discussion of local health policy issues. By giving the neighborhoods and communities input into health policy decisions, the Health Commission will enable San Franciscans to create a new community of interest and new community of action in the area of health service delivery.

**VOTE YES on PROPOSITION C.**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Commission will be of vital importance to the Asian community. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

David Yamakawa
Ernest Wu
Joe Jung
George Suncin
Sophie Wong
Pattie Fong
Willie Gee, D.D.S.

Dr. Yoshio Nakashima
Louis Hop Lee
Samuel Chung

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This proposal to put politics into the Department of Public Health by creating a “commission” to direct it is an example of the misguided philosophy of attacking governmental problems by throwing bureaucracy at them. It should be soundly defeated. Currently, the City’s health officials report to one person, the Chief Administrative Officer, who can respond swiftly to any crisis and set consistent policy. The responsibility for the Department lies with the CAO, not a group of political appointees. When our Charter was adopted in 1932, the freeholders explained the rationale of giving the CAO management responsibility over the Health Department. The idea was “to provide reasonable safeguards AGAINST POLITICAL MANIPULATION.” (Emphasis added) Their report stated the office of CAO was designed to be “protected from political influence as largely as possible . . .” and “it is intended that this officer shall be entirely independent in discharging the function of dressed. Proposition C gives us a platform from which to speak. Vote YES.

Elouve Westbrook
Yvonne Golden
Lorenzo R. Dill
Zuretti L. Goosby, D.D.S
Julianne Malveaux
Eugene Coleman
Naomi T. Gray

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

the office, and particularly, to be free from interference of the mayor, because the latter is subjected to political influence.” Although the Charter was adopted in 1932, its logic still makes powerful sense. Besides blurring lines of responsibility, this iniquitous proposal contradicts health management practices in California and the United States. In fact, the same idea was evaluated in 1971 by a committee established by the supervisors, which concluded that the commission concept, a “seemingly attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another bureaucratic layer in an already cluttered city administrative structure.” To paraphrase The Progress, the Muni is the best proof that “the presence of a commission does not guarantee good management.” Vote NO on Proposition C.

Supervisor Quenin L. Kopp

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The enactment of Proposition C would set the clock back on health care delivery in San Francisco to the 1920s. As proposed, the measure would almost exactly duplicate the system of Health Care abandoned by The City in 1932 because it had become corrupt, politicized and incapable of effectively responding to the growing challenges of modern health care administration.

In 1973 the Board of Supervisors itself considered and rejected a similar Health Commission option. The board’s reason was that commissions do not make effective management tools. "The Commission, seemingly an attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another layer in an already cluttered City administration structure."

The commission concept also goes counter to sound health management practices. Earlier this year, a team of top Bay Area health care professionals was asked to identify the leading municipal hospitals in the country. None of the institutions identified uses a commission form of administration largely because commissions, while perhaps capable of overseeing some urban systems such as mass transit, have proven ineffective and cumbersome.

The argument has been advanced that a commission would allow for greater citizen input into the health department. The fact is that the Department of Health already has some 440 individuals serving on 27 Citizen Advisory Committees—more than with any other city department. The proposed seven member commission would be insufficient in both size and technical competence to do other than deal with the health care in San Francisco on a “crisis-to-crisis” basis.

As we move into the 21st Century, the administration of San Francisco’s health care systems will only become more challenging. A form of governance that proved inadequate 50 years ago and was rejected by the Board of Supervisors eleven years ago as inappropriate, is not the best way to provide for our city’s health care needs of the future. We urge you to vote “No” on Proposition C.

Dr. Frank Lewis, Chief of Staff, San Francisco General Hospital
Walter Newman, Overseer, UCSF
Yori Wada, UC Board of Regents
Dr. Frank Curry, Former Director of Public Health
Dr. Frank Sooy, Chancellor Emeritus, UCSF
Virginia Leishman, Director of Nursing, Laguna Honda Hospital

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

A vote for Proposition C is a vote to politicize health care in San Francisco. The authors of the 1932 City Charter foresaw this when they abolished the city’s highly politicized seven member health commission and placed the Department of Health under the jurisdiction of the Chief Administrative Officer. Proposition C would return San Francisco to the pre-1932 system of politicized health care management.

In writing the 1932 Charter, the authors recognized the need to balance executive authority by splitting it between the Mayor and the CAO. Departments, such as health, which were thought to be best managed if protected from direct political influence, were placed under the jurisdiction of the CAO, who is appointed for a fixed 10 year term to remove the office from political pressure.

Despite the occurrence of problems the system has worked well. San Francisco General has perhaps the best Trauma Unit in the country. The hospital’s AIDS unit is unquestionably the best and most humane in the nation.

Moving control of the city’s health care budget from the Chief Administrative Officer to the Executive will create a “strong mayor” type of government which the Charter was designed to prevent. Health commissioners would necessarily be beholden to the political factions or individuals which lobbied for their appointment and to the mayor who appoints them.

There are alternatives to a Health Commission. Several have already been recommended by a blue ribbon panel of health management experts appointed following the report on General Hospital. We believe these recommendations and perhaps others, including a variation on the health commission concept, deserve further study.

Proposition C would bring about a radical restructuring of government and health care delivery in San Francisco. Both issues are far too important to be decided hastily. We urge a No vote on Proposition C.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, President, Board of Supervisors
Florette White Pomeroy, Consultant
William K. Coblenz, Attorney
Thomas E. Horn, VP, Board of Trustees, War Memorial
J. Gary Shansby, Chairman of the Board, Shaklee Corporation
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission

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

I oppose Proposition C because:

1. It puts the Health Department under the control of politically appointed non-professionals. I cannot agree that this should be done. It brings in politics and throws out expertise.

2. It adds an extra layer of bureaucracy making government more expensive and management more difficult.

_Supervisor Richard Hongisto_

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Your City Hall representatives would have you believe that by replacing our present Health System with a Health Commission, composed of seven members, at a recompense of $100 per month, will improve the services.

_Hogwash. Just another layer of government._

With a budget of $270 millions, 5000 employees would you put your faith in the hands of seven and still maintain the same Health Director?

What we need is a clean sweep of the present management; new faces; new ideas. The Charter provides for this, let's do it—"Now," not later.

_Vote NO on PROPOSITION C_

_Marguerite A. Warren_

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

By creating a health commission for the Public Health Department, the city of San Francisco would create more problems rather than solve them.

Past experience has indicated a need to separate politics from health care. San Francisco would be turning the clock back to a situation in the 1920s when the city had a seven member commission appointed by the Mayor that oversaw the management of the Public Health Department. The delivery of effective health care was seriously compromised by the _politicized department_ which was a direct consequence of the department's health commission.

For this reason, the citizens of San Francisco at that time passed a charter reform that removed the Health Department from the politically appointed commission and placed it in a newly created Chief Administrative Officer who would be secured against political pressures.

The creation of the Health Commission would take 40% of the budget of the Chief Administrative Officer's budget and place it under the control of a politically appointed Commission, thus negating the intent of the Chief Administrative Officer's Department which was created to administer departments that should be removed from political concerns.

_Do not politicize San Francisco's health care. Vote No on Proposition C._

_John H. Jacobs_
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by _bold-face_ type; deletions are indicated by _strike-over_ type.

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, Public Health, and County Agricultural Department; Health Advisory Board, Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of section 11.102 and section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the (Continued on page 82)
Retirement Board Investments

PROPOSITION D
Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?  

YES 261
NO 262

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement Board has complete authority to invest the funds of the Retirement System for city employees. The Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would remove the requirement that the Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California. Instead, the proposition would require the Retirement Board to make investments with the care and skill that a prudent person would make under similar circumstances.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the way the Retirement Board invests pension money. Instead of making only those investments which are legal for insurance companies, the Board would be able to make any investments that a prudent person would make.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Retirement Board to keep making only the same kind of investments which are legal for insurance companies.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-5 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.


Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, increase the cost of government. However, as a result of its authorizing additional flexibility for investments, earnings may be higher or lower than what could have occurred absent this amendment.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 63.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote YES on Proposition D.

The purpose of Proposition D is to clarify the investment responsibility of the Retirement Board and to add language expressly to comply with the recently enacted State Constitutional amendment on fiduciary standards for public pension plans (Proposition 21, June 1984).

Since 1932, the charter has referred to the Insurance Code as the guideline for pension investments.

Insurance Code investment requirements are unsuitable to current pension fund investment practices and severely restrict the ability of the Retirement Board to manage the fund to achieve the best possible investment return for the City and County of San Francisco and the members of the Retirement System.

The added new language will establish firm guidelines for the Retirement Board to discharge its responsibility as the fiduciary for the Retirement Fund. This new language will also serve as increased protection for members of the Retirement System by applying recognized fiduciary standards for which there is considerable statutory and case law.

In summary, the proposed charter amendment serve a dual purpose: it removes obsolete and ambiguous language and brings the Retirement System into compliance with the State Constitution. Both changes will enhance and improve the System's investment capabilities and the ability to achieve its goals and objectives.

Proposition D is endorsed and supported by the Retirement Board and the Board of Supervisors.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This is a worthwhile Charter amendment which updates obsolete and ambiguous provisions on how the Retirement Board can invest funds. It institutes standards consistent with a recent voter-approved amendment to the California Constitution. Investment practices have been refined dramatically in the past 50 years, and income and appreciation choices have increased tremendously. The investment professionals working for the Retirement System now are prevented from making the very most prudent investments possible, and City employees and taxpayers are, thus, prejudiced and hurt.

Present investment rules are based upon the State Insurance Code, which contravenes contemporary investment practices. Proposition D will give more latitude in making high-return investments, but will also retain vigorous guidelines on investment of Retirement System funds while increasing the protection of City employees. It will save money for taxpayers by enabling a better return on Retirement System assets. It's logical. That's why I recommend a "yes" vote.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive, and may continue to receive, benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established. Provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies in California.

The retirement board shall discharge its duties with respect to the system with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with these matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like aims.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ____________________________________________

Address __________________________________________ Apt. # _____

Telephone No. (required) _____________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) ________________________

Signature ________________________________________
Surviving Spouse Benefits

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?  

YES  264

NO  265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a health care fund for active and retired employees. The City's contribution to this fund equals the average amount contributed to health care funds for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco. The City does not contribute anything for spouses of active or retired employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would provide that the City contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the health care fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Bill Maher.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs and present membership data of the Health Service System, in excess of $990,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 67.
Surviving Spouse Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This charter amendment calls for extending a limited measure of aid from the City and County of San Francisco for the health care of the surviving spouse of an active or retired City employee.

Under existing statute, the City and County and its employees, active or retired, share the cost of health care for the employee, their spouse and children. However, upon the death of the employee, the City and County’s share of payments to the health care system stops.

Thus, the surviving spouse is compelled to pick up the entire cost for the health care plan while struggling to survive on a reduced family income and, at the same time, contend with ever increasing medical/hospital expenses and everyday living costs for themselves and eligible family dependents.

Proposition E will allow the City and County to continue paying its share into the health care system and not force the surviving spouse and eligible family dependents to assume the entire financial burden for health care payments.

Since the number of surviving spouses affected is very small, less than 1400, the cost to the taxpayer for the City and County is minimal.

The changes proposed by Proposition E should have been made many years ago; it is long overdue. We urge you to support this important measure.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Justice tempered with compassion. VOTE YES. Surviving spouses of City workers receive an automatic 50% cut in retirement pay upon the death of their partners. Why further burden this small group by withdrawing subsidy for health care?

The Retirement System actuary has officially confirmed that the average pension check for this group is $300.00 per month; incidentally, below the nationally quoted poverty level.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by William T. Reed, Chairman Legislative Committee, Retired Employees City & County of San Francisco Helen McAtee, Chairperson Philip Kearney, President, and retired manager of the Health Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Health Service Board which administers the health benefits provided to active and retired employees and their dependents fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the surviving spouse upon the death of a retired employee.

This financial problem is especially acute because a surviving spouse's pension is cut by 50% at the death of the employee and because of the high cost of medical insurance. Medical cost increases have outpaced general inflation rates over the last three (3) years by about two to one.

We urge your “YES” vote on Proposition “E” on the basis of need and equity.

Abraham Bernstein, M.D., President Health Service Board of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Surviving spouses of city employees need this for a relatively comfortable widowhood. Let’s extend a small measure of consideration to those who are left on their own.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Proposition E if approved would require the city to subsidize the health premiums of the surviving spouses of non-uniformed city employees. The cost to the city would amount to $990,000 per year and give city employees a benefit that is not normally enjoyed by workers in private industry.

The majority of private employees have health plans that allow surviving spouses to be members of such plans but the employer does not subsidize the premiums of these survivors in anyway. Being permitted to join a group plan that provides comprehensive coverage at a reasonable rate is a sufficient benefit in and of itself.

If this amendment is approved it will violate the spirit of the Charter provision that sets city employee salaries and benefits at the average of that which prevails in the metropolitan Bay Area. We believe in fair treatment and compensation for city employees and our current rules provide exactly that.

Vote No on Proposition E.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by struck-through type.

§425 Health Service System Fund
There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of members and retired persons of the parking authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons, and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons.

A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employee Retirement System, and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

The city and county, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) Honor the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board, and the amount so contributed for any fiscal year shall be the average contribution of each of their members.

(c) The city and county shall contribute to the health service system fund an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board, in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(d) Voluntary contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouse of an active employee, and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the voluntary contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare provided however that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouse of an active employee as is provided for active employee members.

(e) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of the charter and whose compensation, herein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereinafter imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendment to this section contained in the proposition hereinafter submitted to the electorate on November 5, 1972, if approved shall be effective July 1, 1973.
Employee Death Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?

YES 267
NO 268

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, who is a member of the Retirement System is entitled to a death benefit of six months salary if he or she dies, regardless of cause, before retirement. The benefit is paid to the employee's estate or designated beneficiary.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would provide that if an officer or employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, is injured through external and violent means in the course of employment and the employee dies within 180 days of the injury, an additional benefit of 12 months salary would be paid to the employee's estate or designated beneficiary.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to pay an additional benefit of 12 months salary to a city employee who dies from an injury caused by external and violent means in the course of employment.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to provide an additional death benefit to these city employees who die from external and violent means in the course of employment.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted "No."

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the number of employees and their respective salary rates which qualify for payment under the provisions of this proposed amendment. Based on experience to date, the cost of this additional amount should not be substantial."

TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 69.
Employee Death Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F provides a small compensation for the survivor of a city employee (non Police or Fire) killed in the line of duty. Let’s agree to this minor expenditure for the survivors of those who have died in city service.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.
Only rarely is a city employee killed in the line of duty, but death can come with fierce suddenness.
Two Muni workers were crushed by cable car machinery in 1978; the following year, two Water Department employees were murdered at the Lake Merced Pumping Station; and in March 1981, a Hetch Hetchy lineman fell to his death.
For the families of the vast majority of city workers, there is little protection when death comes. Police officers and fire fighters already have special death benefits.

Proposition F would cover all other workers in the City Retirement System. Proposition F will afford some measure of protection to city workers killed in the performance of their duties.
Proposition F will provide to beneficiaries an additional full year salary to the half-year presently provided, for a total of 18 months.
This is a small amount for a life given in the service of our city. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.
Proposition F is designed to correct a serious inequity on behalf of miscellaneous members of the Retirement System who are killed in line of duty or who die as a result of a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury.
Under current charter provisions, a designated beneficiary of a member who dies in the course of employment from any cause receives the member’s contributions to the system, plus six months’ salary.
Proposition F focuses only on those members who are killed in the line of duty or who die within 180 days from a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury. Beneficiaries of such members will be accorded an additional insurance benefit of twelve months’ salary.
The payment of additional compensation to a designated beneficiary will be subject to the independent hearing officer process as set forth in the City charter.
Proposition F is fair and equitable and, based on actuarial projections, the cost is minimal.
Proposition F is sponsored and endorsed by the Retirement Board, unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, and strongly supported by Mayor Dianne Feinstein.
Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

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

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

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the Charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.671, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

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

(Continued on page 84)
Police Probationary Period

PROPOSITION G

Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?

YES 270
NO 271

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers entering the Police Department serve a one-year probationary period. During the first 32 weeks, the police officer goes through the police training program. After successfully completing training, the officer is then assigned to regular police duties. The Police Department has 20 weeks to evaluate the officer while on regular police duty. After this 20 week period, the probation is complete.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would extend the probationary period of the police officer to one year after the completion of the training. In no event would it extend the probationary period beyond 84 weeks from the date of entry. Any termination for breach of duty or misconduct would require charges and a hearing before the Police Commission.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the probationary period for a police officer to be extended to one year after completing the police training course but not to exceed 84 weeks.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the probationary period for a police officer to remain one year after the date of entry into the department.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
Police Probationary Period

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Your YES vote for this amendment will enable the Police Department to provide more effective police services by ensuring that after officers graduate from the Academy and complete a field training program, an adequate probationary evaluation period exists to determine an officer's fitness to perform police duties. Society demands much from its police officers. As the nature of police work has become increasingly complex, training and performance evaluation functions must meet the needs of an ever-evolving profession.

Great expenditure of time and money are invested in training police officers. Presently, if a recruit is not deemed ready for duty, the probationary period can be completed during any retraining, thus making it difficult and costly to determine ultimate fitness for duty.

By voting YES, you will give the Chief of Police time necessary to adequately train and evaluate an officer's performance and to better ensure quality police services.

The Police Department has met and conferred with the Police Officers' Association regarding this amendment and has obtained that organization's support for its passage.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Police Chief asked for a longer probationary period because it is needed. Vote yes.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition G.

In recent years, because San Francisco has had the financial strength to do so, we've steadily expanded the size of the Police Department.

It is now the largest ever, with 1987 officers.

More and more officers are being assigned to our neighborhoods on beats and in patrol cars. We want the best officers possible.

That's why Proposition G is so important. It will give the Department greater ability to screen out officers who do not measure up to the strict standards of professionalism this city demands.

Proposition G will extend the probation period for a new officer to one complete year following completion of his or her field training.

Presently, probation starts when an officer is first inducted into the Department, before 18 weeks of class work in the City's outstanding Police Academy and another 14 weeks of field training.

As strenuous as the class work and the training may be, the real test of an officer is on the street.

That's where his or her coolness, competence and compassion—in fact, all the qualities that this city wants in a superior police department—can be observed and tested.

Proposition G will give the department a full year to evaluate an officer in uniform and on the job.

Those who don't measure up can be dismissed after a departmental hearing. Protected will be the City's rightful concern that our police officers can truly be described as the City's finest.

Proposition G is a common-sense measure, sought by the Chief of Police, that will strengthen the San Francisco Police Department. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This is probably the most important proposition on this Fall's ballot, a common sense measure. It deals with the Police Department, which has the ultimate responsibility for the protection of persons and property in our community. It increases the probationary period of police officers by one year. It is intended to ensure that the men and women who protect us are of the highest quality possible. Right now, police officers actually have only a four month probationary period. That's because they spend over 12 months probation in class and training, and only four months on the streets and on the job.

Police commanders need more time to evaluate the recruits' "street" performance. Proposition G does that by extending the on-the-job probationary period up to one year. For the sake of our children, neighbors and all San Franciscans, I want to be sure that a police officer is fully competent from a practical standpoint, not merely because of a classroom perspective. Therefore, I support Proposition G, and I urge you to vote for it, too.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Police Motorcycle Pay

PROPOSITION H

Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?

YES 274
NO 275

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and who are assigned to the Traffic Division get bonus pay. Police officers who ride motorcycles as part of their job, but who are assigned to duties other than traffic, do not get bonus pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would give all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job to get the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want only those San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and are assigned to the Traffic Division to get bonus pay.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted "No."

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current rates of pay, staffing and assignments by the police department, the cost of government would be increased by approximately $74,000 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Honda Motorcycle Unit of the San Francisco Police Department has, because of antiquated charter language, been denied payment of the hazard pay which is currently given the two-wheel motorcycle officers in the Traffic Division.

Because the primary function of the Honda Motorcycle Unit is crime fighting and not traffic enforcement, the word “traffic” must be deleted from the charter in order to compensate equally all officers who perform hazardous motorcycle duty.

Please join us in voting YES for this very fair charter amendment.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

In 1970, the San Francisco Police Department created a unit of light weight motorcycles to patrol Golden Gate Park and the beaches surrounding the City. In 1977 these duties were drastically changed to counteract rising street crimes around the Western Addition. Neighborhood associations, seeing the effectiveness of the unit, also requested additional patrols by these motorcycle officers. Since 1977 the Honda Unit (as it is known now) has been assigned to virtually every neighborhood in the City to reduce purse snatches, “red light” robberies, drag racing, and street narcotics traffic, along with demonstrations, marches, parades, and sporting events all over the City.

Also occurring since 1977 have been injuries to these highly visible, highly vulnerable motorcycle officers. Some of these injuries include one officer hit head on, and another officer suffering a leg broken by an auto which ran a red light. There have been numerous officers struck by other vehicles causing injuries, and injuries due to other road hazards (oil slicks, pothole etc.). These have increased sharply since the Honda Unit has been assigned to primarily street patrol. One officer was shot twice while patrolling the Western Addition for purse snatches.

It is obvious that these officers are no longer “just” patrolling the parks and beaches as they were initially intended, but are now assigned to patrol the streets of the most crime-ridden areas of the City combating street crimes and enforcing traffic laws. These officers on prior occasions have requested Motorcycle Hazard Pay (which traffic enforcement two-wheel motorcycle officers already receive) for their patrol of these neighborhoods and streets on the two-wheel motorcycles but have been denied because of outdated wording in the Charter. Passage of this amendment would correct this inequity.

Al Casiato
President, S.F.P.O.A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

All police officers who ride motorcycles in the course of duty face special danger and deserve the premium pay already allowed for motorcycle traffic officers.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

A police officer on a two-wheeler is often the first on the scene of a major crime or emergency. Day after day, there is no more hazardous duty for our police.

Whether on a motorcycle in pursuit of a felon on city streets, or on a motorbike on patrol in the remote areas of the City's parklands, an officer lives with danger. Because they can cut through traffic, the two-wheelers often are first to arrive at a shooting or bank robbery or car crash.

The City Charter has long recognized the dangers inherent in this essential police work and has provided hazard-pay for motorcycle officers of the Traffic Division. Proposition H simply extends hazard-pay to the 17 or so officers on the equally-perilous motorbike detail.

The amount of money involved is small—only $178 a month for each officer. Proposition H is small recognition of the dangers the police daily face in the line of duty. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor
Military & Social Spending Initiative

PROPOSITION I

(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?

YES 278  
NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco does not have an official position on whether federal taxes should be used for certain kinds of defense spending.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I says the Board of Supervisors must inform the President and certain other federal officials that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether they want their tax dollars used for certain kinds of “excessive military expenditures”, as defined in the measure. Proposition I also says the City’s Chief Administrative Officer must publish an annual report on the amount of federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents, what portion of these taxes are used for military spending, and what portion are used for social or human needs. The Board of Supervisors would appoint a seven-member Citizens’ Advisory Committee to oversee the preparation of the report.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you think federal officials should be told that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending. You also want the City to publish an annual report on how federal tax dollars collected from San Francisco residents are spent.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t think taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending, and you don’t want the City to publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition relating to military and social expenditures had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The proponents of the petition had gathered 12,271 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 2. The proponents are officially listed as G.C. Barnes, L.J. Crowe, H.J. Hobi and R.A. Wall.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,304 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

74

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time but should not be substantial.”

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 75.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This initiative should be passed because it educates people about excessive military spending and sends a clear message to the Federal Government that people want a choice as to how their taxes are spent.

Homer Hobbi
Chairperson
The Humanist Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why waste taxpayers’ money for a handful of misguided individuals? City government is mandated to govern local citizens affairs.

Martin Eng
School Board Candidate

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following terms are defined:
(a) Excessive military expenditures: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is destined for research, development, and production of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons; research, development, and production of outer space laser-beam technology weapons (popularly known as "star-war" weapons); research, development, and production of chemical and biological warfare; military aid, both overt and covert, to undemocratic and/or repressive governments (governments that violate the basic human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948 by the United Nations).
(b) Social or human needs: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is used for education, housing, health and human services, public transportation, and the arts.
(c) San Francisco taxpayer: any individual who pays federal taxes and who reports his or her principal place of residence within the San Francisco city limits; and any corporation who is considered by the Internal Revenue Service as residing in San Francisco.
(d) Portion of revenues in 3(a) budgeted for social or human needs;
(e) Average individual tax contribution;
(f) Average individual tax contribution allocated to (1) excessive military expenditures and (2) social needs.
(g) The Board of Supervisors shall appoint a Citizen's Advisory Committee every year to oversee the preparation of the report and to ensure that its findings are accurate and impartial. The Citizen's Advisory Committee shall consist of seven members, at least three of whom shall be volunteers from non-profit organizations in San Francisco.
The report shall use the most current figures available from the federal government at the time of publication, citing the sources for the computations. If the necessary tax and budgetary breakdowns for San Francisco were not available, the report shall base itself upon tax revenue and budgetary figures for the entire nation (or subdivision thereof) and produce accurate extrapolations.
The Chief Administrative Officer shall publish the report in the two newspapers of largest circulation in San Francisco, no earlier than 14 days before but no later than the normal deadline for the filing of federal income taxes for individuals.
South African Investment Policy

PROPOSITION J

(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?

YES 283
NO 284

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco has no policy about the investment of pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco and its agencies not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa. This would be the official policy until Black people are given full political and civil rights by the government of South Africa.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want it to be the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City and County of San Francisco to have an official policy against investing pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition on South African investment policy had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Julianne Malveaux, the official proponent of the petition drive, had gathered 11,404 signatures which she turned in to the Registrar on August 8.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,520 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, investment income may be affected in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount.”

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We support removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa because we believe the city of San Francisco should not support the reprehensible institution of apartheid. Non-whites in South Africa are denied freedom of association, freedom of mobility, freedom of speech, and voting rights. San Franciscans support this inequality when city pension funds are invested in companies that do business with South Africa.

This investment is also a very risky investment since any civil unrest in South Africa may lower the value of the investment. Other investment possibilities will equal or exceed current yields on the pension portfolio.

We support this initiative because we support equal rights for all, and because we believe in prudent investment of city pension funds.

San Franciscans for Responsible Investments
Julianne Malveaux, Chair
Essie Mormen, Co-Chair
Henry Clark, Co-Chair
Arlo Hale Smith, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

By supporting Proposition J, San Franciscans join citizens from fourteen other cities, including Washington, D.C., Boston, and Berkeley, in removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa. Our support strikes a blow against the apartheid policy that has denied Black and non-white people equal rights in South Africa.

Removing pension funds from South Africa makes good economic sense. International investment advisors recommend against such investment because of the frailty of the South African political situation. Significantly, none of the cities that have divested funds from South Africa have had lower earnings since divestment.

It is both morally just and fiscally sound to vote YES for Proposition J!

Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Economics
S.F. State University
Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud that we were the first state in the nation to vote to sell from our public pension fund portfolio all investments in firms doing business in South Africa. Since the passage of this landmark legislation, it has been our experience that divestiture makes not only a strong moral statement against apartheid, but divestiture has proven to have had no negative impact on our pension earnings.

I urge San Franciscans to give serious consideration to both the moral and the financial arguments as you consider divestiture as a policy of your great city.

Michael Dukakis
Governor, Massachusetts
Submitted by John Burke

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For over a decade individuals and institutional investors, including local and state governments, universities, foundations, churches, Taft-Hartley pension funds and health and welfare plans have refused to invest in, and divested from corporations and financial institutions economically supporting apartheid in South Africa.

They are investing and earning competitive returns in housing, small business, alternative energy, and other socially productive investments which create employment and prevent capital from being exported to South Africa.

It is fiduciarily irresponsible to risk beneficiaries' pension assets by investing in companies in South Africa.

Many trade and corporate risk analysts have recommended no investment exposure in South Africa. The Rockefeller Study Commission on U.S. policy toward Southern Africa, recently recommended no new corporate investments in that white, minority ruled country.

Vote to create jobs, housing and small business in your community, not apartheid in South Africa. Vote YES on Proposition J.

John Harrington, President
Working Assets Money Fund

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

"For the sake of the children of all South Africans, black and white, for God's sake, for the sake of world peace, the international community must take action, it must exert pressure on South Africa—political pressure, diplomatic pressure and above all, economic pressure." 

(Bishop Desmond Tutu, General Secretary-South African Council of Churches, 1981)

The apartheid system continues because of Western support. The South African Council of Churches has said "foreign investors must know they are investing in bitterness one of the most vicious systems since Nazism." As members of the international religious community, we cannot longer let others make decisions which contradict all that we believe in. We urge San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition J as a specific, responsible way to express their moral rejection of apartheid.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I support Proposition J and encourage a statewide effort to remove pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON "J"

STATEMENT BY UNION OFFICIALS

The United Nations General Assembly declared South African apartheid "a crime against humanity"; and that investment in South Africa "encourages the apartheid policies of that country".

Representatives of several hundred million unionists, meeting under UN - U.S. auspices, called for the elimination of stocks of companies investing in South Africa, from pension funds.

As unionists and human rights advocates we support this measure.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Committee for International Support of Trade Union Rights
Charles Lamb
Anthony L. Ramos
Jack Goldberger
Curtis McClain
Frank Soria
Stanley M. Smith
Marv Anne Petersen
Emery J. Twomey
Walid L. Johnson
Law Himing
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

To protect American interests and to halt the spread of Communist influence into South Africa, responsible action is needed to end legally-required racial segregation and to reasonably extend voting rights.

Proposition J is an important step towards a moderate solution of the South African problem.

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman

Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee

Todd Roast
Republican State Senate Nominee

Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

WARNING TO VOTERS

Disregard any self-serving statements by Peter Ashe, Meta Stanley, and their controversial Retirement Board in connection with Proposition J.

The Retirement Board has done more than just aid South Africa by its investment policies.

The Retirement Board has made serious investment errors, produced poor investment yields, and run up market value investment portfolio losses of $160,852,320 (as of 3/30/84) with Prudential-Bache.

Mike Garza
Robert Silvestri
Max Woods

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Rainbow Coalition and all members, support this initiative. Stop investments of San Francisco pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. Support Human Rights. People have a right to know that their pension funds are being used to support a racist, repressive, apartheid system, that denies basic human and civil rights to 24 million Africans. We have a right to know that a Black man can be detained in the South African penal system for as long as two years, for not having identification. That Black people there are denied the right to vote, buy or sell land, and the right to live or work where they choose. Support Human Rights. Vote in favor of prop. J.

Gale White
African American of the Rainbow
Rev. Howard Gloyd
Northern California Chairman
The Rainbow Coalition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco CISPES supports the removal of city pension fund investments from firms that profit from apartheid.

The government of South Africa, like the government of El Salvador, denies its people the most basic human rights: freedom from arbitrary arrest and torture; freedom of speech and association; and the right to a decent standard of living.

San Francisco Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador

In 1983, San Franciscans said no to military aid to El Salvador. In 1984, let us say no to investments in South Africa.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Apartheid continues to be used to enslave black working people in South Africa. International labor has consistently condemned apartheid, and agrees that divestment from South Africa is an effective means of pressure.

David Aroner, Executive Director
SEIU Local 535
Timothy Twomey, Secretary-Treasurer
Hospital and Institutional Workers
Local 250
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director
United Public Employees Local 390/400
SEIU

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For the Black majority, apartheid in South Africa means no right to vote, unionize or speak out. Those who resist are murdered, tortured and imprisoned. Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, has been imprisoned for over twenty years. Apartheid is fascism!

U.S. companies investing in South Africa profit from low wages paid to Black workers, and play a key role in keeping apartheid alive. Say NO to apartheid and racism—Vote YES on Prop J.

Henry Clark, Candidate for
Congress, Fifth Congressional District
Gloria La Riva
All-Peoples' Congress
Johnnie Stevens
Southern Africa Freedom Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Joint Council of the Service Employees International Union has unanimously endorsed this proposal. The Union took this action because of the economic oppression of citizens by the South African Government, because of the termination of trade union rights and the arrest of union leaders, and because of the moral “Crime against humanity” of Apartheid.

Timothy J. Twomey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

South African apartheid is condemned the world over. Even the Reagan Administration expresses opposition.

Yet South Africa and apartheid continue to flourish, subjecting all non-whites to the vilest humiliations, discrimination, and exploitation.

San Francisco supports apartheid through our investment of municipal pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. By their very presence there, these companies maintain the status quo. Otherwise, the ruling white minority would not welcome these investments! We allow apartheid to continue, despite all the rhetoric we direct at South Africa.

San Franciscans can make responsible investments elsewhere. Voting YES on J, we join other cities in cutting the taproot—foreign finance—which allows the horrors of South Africa to go on, and on, and on. . . . End it! Vote YES, against apartheid!

Executive Committee
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY A PROPOSITION OF ISSUING REVENUE BONDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.312 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $104,000,000 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, FINANCING, IMPROVING AND DEVELOPING WATER DEPARTMENT FACILITIES; AND CONSOLIDATING SAID SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 1984.

WHEREAS, Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the Board of Supervisors in each instance, the Public Utilities Commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities of the San Francisco Water Department subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of Charter Section 7.300, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco by resolution No. 84-0563 adopted July 24, 1984, pursuant to said Section 7.312, has recommended that the Board of Supervisors, by resolution, submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held for that purpose on November 6, 1984, the proposition of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1947, as it read on June 5, 1966, and Charter Section 7.312 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities; under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission in said resolution 84-0563;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

Section 1. A special revenue bond election is hereby ordered and will be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 6, 1984, at which election there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County the proposition of issuing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of providing funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, all as set forth in the following proposition:

Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds

Shall the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to Charter Section 7.312 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing additions, betterments and improvements to the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system, including filtration and treatment works and plants, reservoirs and other water supply, storage and distribution facilities, lands and equipment necessary or convenient for the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system?

Section 2. Said revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 (herein called the "Bonds") are proposed to be issued to finance improvements to an enterprise (herein called the "Enterprise") which is herein defined to be the City and County of San Francisco municipal water system, storage and distribution systems of the San Francisco Water Department, including all of the presently existing municipal water system of the City and County and all additions, betterments, extensions and improvements thereto. Said existing water system and the proposed improvements thereto shall constitute a single, unified integrated enterprise; and the revenue therefrom shall be pledged to the payment of the Bonds. It is hereby found and declared that said municipal water systems is necessary to enable the City and County to exercise its municipal powers and functions, namely, to furnish sufficient water for any present or future beneficial use of the City and County.

(a) The purpose for which the Bonds are proposed to be issued is to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, including any expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith.

(b) The estimated costs of the acquisition, construction, financing, improvement and development is $104,000,000. Said estimated cost includes all costs and expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, engineering, inspection, legal and fiscal agents' fees, cost of the revenue bond election and of the issuance of the Bonds, bond reserve funds, and working capital and bond interest estimated to accrue during the construction period and for a period of not to exceed 12 months after completion of construction.

(c) The maximum principal amount of the Bonds proposed to be issued is $104,000,000.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at said special revenue bond election the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution, and designates and refers to said proposition in the form of ballot hereafter prescribed for use at said election.

(a) Said special revenue bond election shall be held and conducted, and the votes thereafter canvassed and the returns thereof made, and the result thereof ascertained and determined as herein provided; and in all particulars not described by this resolution, said special election shall be held and the votes canvassed pursuant to law for general municipal elections in the City and County and pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 52 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) All persons qualified to vote at municipal elections in the City and County upon the date of the election herein provided for shall be qualified to vote upon the proposition submitted at said special revenue bond election.

(c) Said special revenue bond election is hereby consolidated with the general municipal election to be held in the City and County on November 6, 1984, pursuant to the Charter of the City and County. The presence, polling places and officers of election for said special revenue bond election shall be the same as those established
and designated for said general municipal election. Reference is hereby made to the notice of election by the Registrar of Voters setting forth the precincts, polling places and officers of election for said general municipal election, to be published on or about October 15, 1984 for more particular description of said precincts, polling places and officers of election.

(d) The ballot used at said general municipal election and said special revenue bond election hereby consolidated therewith shall have printed thereon, in addition to all other matters required by law, the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution.

(e) Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

If and to the extent that voting machines are used at said special revenue bond election such machines shall be so arranged that any qualified voter may vote for said proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "YES" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for said proposition, and may vote against it by pulling down a lever over the word "NO" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote against said proposition. The statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material used in voting machines shall read substantially as follows:

$104,000,000 San Francisco Water Department Revenue Bonds.

Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with law.

Section 4. If the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution shall be authorized by the qualified voters of the City and County by the votes of a majority of all the voters voting on said proposition, the Bonds may be issued and sold for the purpose set forth in Section 2 of this resolution.

The Bonds are to be revenue bonds, payable exclusively from the revenues of the Enterprise and such other funds from any source as may be legally available for such purpose and may be used by the City and County for such purpose without incurring indebtedness. The Bonds are not to be secured by the taxing power of the City and County, and shall be issued under Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C, Continued from page 61

bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, a deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy or other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

The department of public works shall have powers and duties relating to street traffic, subject to the laws relating thereto, as follows:

(a) to cooperate with and assist the police department in the promotion of
traffic safety education;
(b) to receive, study and give prompt attention to complaints relating to street design or traffic devices or the absence thereof;
(c) to collect, compile, analyze and interpret traffic and parking data and to analyze and interpret traffic accident information;
(d) to engage in traffic research and traffic planning; and
(e) to cooperate for the best performance of these functions with any department and agency of the city and county and the state as may be necessary.

The department shall submit to the traffic bureau of the police department, for its review and recommendation, all proposed plans relating to street traffic control devices; provided, however, that the bureau may waive submission and review of plans of particular devices designated by it. Failure of the said traffic bureau to submit to the department its recommendation on any proposed plan within fifteen (15) days after receipt shall be considered an automatic approval of said traffic bureau. The department shall not, with respect to any traffic control devices, implement such plan until the recommendation of the traffic bureau has been reviewed or until the fifteen (15) day period has elapsed.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county upon paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendation of the chief of the department.

Department of Public Health, which shall be administered by a director of health, who shall be a regularly licensed physician or surgeon in the State of California, with not less than 10 years' practice in his profession immediately preceding his appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician or surgeon requirement may be waived by the board of supervisors. He shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The chief administrative officer shall have power to appoint and to remove an assistant director of public health for hospital services, who shall be responsible for the administrative and business management of the institutions of the department of public health, including, but not limited to, the San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Home, Hassler Health Home, and the Emergency Hospital Service, and who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of assistant director of public health for hospital services shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the institutions of the department of public health.

The director of public health shall have power to appoint and remove an administrator of San Francisco General Hospital who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of administrator shall be held only by a physician or hospital administrator who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the San Francisco General Hospital.

Health Advisory Board. There is hereby created a health advisory board of seven members, three of whom shall be physicians and one dentist, all regularly certificated. Members of the board shall serve without compensation. They shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer for terms of four years; provided, however, that those first appointed shall classify themselves by lot so that the terms of one physician and one lay member shall expire in 1923, 1924 and 1925, respectively, and the term of one member in 1926. Such board shall consider and report on problems and matters under the jurisdiction of the department of public health and shall consult, advise with and make recommendations to the director of health relative to the functions and affairs of the department. The recommendations of such board shall be made in writing to the director of health and to the chief administrative officer.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center.

If in the election of June 2, 1904 November 6, 1904 two or more propositions amending section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

PART TWENTY-ONE: HEALTH COMMISSION

3.695 Composition of Department; Commission

The public health department shall consist of a health commission, a director of public health and such employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter. The department shall be under the management of a health commission consisting of seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor. Said commission shall have less than a majority of direct providers of health care. Direct providers of health care shall mean all
health professionals and others whose "primary current activity" is the provision of patient care or the administration of facilities or institutions which provide patient care. The term of each member of the commission shall be four years, commencing at twelve o'clock, noon, on the 15th day of January in the year 1985; provided, that the respective terms of office of those first appointed shall be as follows: two for four years, two for three years, two for two years, and one for one year. Vacancies occurring on said commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of each of said members shall be filled by the mayor. No commissioner may serve more than two consecutive terms or a total of eight years.

The compensation of each commissioner shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month. The commissioners shall annually elect one of their members president. They shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the governance of the commission.

3.696 Director of Public Health; Other Executives

The health commission shall appoint a director of public health who shall serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The director of public health shall be a regularly licensed physician in the State of California, with not less than five years' experience in public health administration immediately preceding his or her appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician requirement may be waived by the health commission. The director of public health shall be the chief executive of the commission and shall, subject to the approval of the commission, manage all operations under its jurisdiction. The director shall have power to appoint and remove a deputy director for operations, a deputy director for community health programs, an administrator for San Francisco General Hospital and an administrator for Laguna Honda Hospital. The administrators of San Francisco General Hospital and of Laguna Honda Hospital shall have power to appoint and remove associate administrators to the extent such positions are created by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

These positions shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter and shall be held by persons who possess the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the divisions and institutions of the department. However, any person who has civil service status in any of the above positions on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have such status under the civil service provisions of this charter. All positions in the department legally authorized shall be continued and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.697 Powers and Duties

The health commission shall manage and control the city and county hospitals, emergency medical services, and all matters pertaining to the preservation, promotion, and protection of the lives, health and mental health of the inhabitants of the city and county, except where this charter specifically grants that power to another department. It may also determine the nature and character of public health nuisances and provide for their abatement.

The commission shall inspect the sanitary conditions of the municipal institutions of the city and county, including jails and all public buildings; of the disposition of the dead; of the disposition of garbage, offal and offensive substances.

The commission shall be a policy-making and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in section 3.500 of this charter. The commission shall have the power to establish and make appointments to advisory committees as it shall deem necessary.

8.107 Suspension and Removal

Any elective officer, and any member of the civil service commission, health commission, or public utilities commission or school board may be suspended by the mayor and removed by the board of supervisors for official misconduct, and the mayor shall appoint a qualified person to discharge the duties of the office during the period of suspension. On such suspension, the mayor shall immediately notify the supervisors thereof in writing and the cause therefor, and shall present written charges against such suspended officer to the board of supervisors at or prior to its next regular meeting following such suspension, and shall immediately furnish copy of same to such officer, who shall have the right to appear with counsel before the board in his defense. Hearing by the supervisors shall be held not less than five days after the filing of written charges. If the charges are deemed to be sustained by not less than a three-fourths vote of all members of the board, the suspended officer shall be removed from office; if not so sustained, or if not acted on by the board of supervisors within thirty (30) days after the filing of written charges, the suspended officer shall thereby be reinstated.

The mayor must immediately remove from office any elective officer convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, and failure of the mayor so to act shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part. Any appointee of the mayor, exclusive of civil service, health, recreation and park, and public utilities commissioners, and members of the school board, may be removed by the mayor. Any nominee or appointee of the mayor whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, except the chief administrative officer and the controller, as in this charter otherwise provided, may be removed by a majority of such board and with the concurrence of the mayor. In each case, written notice shall be given or transmitted to such appointee of such removal, the date of effectiveness thereof, and the reasons therefor, a copy of which notice shall be printed at length in the journal of proceedings of the board of supervisors, together with such reply in writing as such official may make. Any appointee of the mayor or the board of supervisors guilty of official misconduct or convicted of crime involving moral turpitude must be removed by the mayor or the board of supervisors, as the case may be, and failure of the mayor or any supervisor to take such action shall constitute official misconduct on his or their part.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION F — Continued from page 69**

"Retirement allowance," or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for life unless a different term of payment is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the *workmen's* *workers' compensation laws of the State of California shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the re-
The compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection F (f) of this section shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this subsection B (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this subsection B (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said subsection F (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of sixty years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty years, computed under subsection G (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection G (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed seventy-five percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection C (e) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within thirty 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of sixty-five 65 years may elect, without right to revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month upon retirement after thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty years, and provided further that as to any member within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for
each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

C (e) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in subsection C (g) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in subsection A (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowance shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earnable by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

D (d) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

E (e) If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause:

1. If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection E (e):

   A (A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

   B (B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

2. If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subdivision B (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If, at the date of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable

under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

   a (A) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

   b (B) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in subdivision (1) in any of the amounts above which would otherwise be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this subsection E (e), for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this subsection E (e), any allowance payable under this subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members;

F (f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system,
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provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least ten years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000), he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety (90) days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, ninety (90) days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus one and two-thirds (1 2/3) percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

G (g) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

(1) Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous officer or employee.

(2) Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member or of either of such departments to employment entitling him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contribution standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either of such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

(5) The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and services rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefore shall be required of the city and county.

H (h) All payments provided under this section shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7 1/2) percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection G (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection H (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), subsection H (h), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodic actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be
made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision § (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of thirty 30 years.

(3) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provision of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(4) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection B (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said subsection B (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(5) No person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, in so far as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(6) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections B (b), e (e), F (f) and (I) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(M) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, no shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.584-5 Death Benefit

If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause:

(a) If no benefit is payable under Subsection B (b) of this section:

(1) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(2) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(b) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Section 8.584-2, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of eighteen 18 years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen 18 years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subsection (b), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of eighteen 18 years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen 18 years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subsection (b) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subsection (a) of this section, the amount of said benefit payable under Subsection (a) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subsection (b) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

(1) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(2) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there be no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subsection (a) of this section in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of eighteen 18 years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this section, for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so
made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this section, any allowance payable under this §subsection (b) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

Upon the death of a member after retirement, an allowance, in addition to the death benefit provided in the immediately preceding paragraph, shall be paid to his surviving spouse, until such surviving spouse's death or remarriage, equal to one-half of his retirement allowance as it was prior to optional modification and prior to reduction as provided in §subsection (a) of §section 8.514 of this charter, but exclusive of the part of such allowance which was provided by additional contributions. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this paragraph to a surviving spouse unless such surviving spouse was married to said member at least one year prior to his retirement. If such retired person leaves no such surviving spouse, or if such surviving spouse should die or remarry before every child of such deceased retired person attains the age of 18 eighteen years, the allowance which such surviving spouse would have received had he or she lived and not remarried shall be paid to retired person's child or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

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 twelve 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 one-year twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve 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 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four 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 thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated in his position without prejudice, and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of his appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which he was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotive classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall 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.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments.

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its
duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in Section 3,531 of this Charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefore shall be based thereon.

The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in Section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month now provided in Subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean “compensation earnable” as used in Section 8,549.

The term “police officers or patrolmen patrol officers” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by Section 8,561 of this Charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, be such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in Subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3,542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall
be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter. For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firemen" "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective rate of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may award any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers or firemen firefighters provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uni-
IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT VOTING

You can vote for any candidate, regardless of party. This is a General Election and you can vote for any candidate on your ballot. Political party restrictions only apply at Primary Elections (in June).

Do not vote for more than the authorized number of candidates or none of your votes for that contest will be counted. Most candidate contests specify "Vote for one" but you can vote for up to six supervisors and up to four School and College Board members. If you make a mistake and vote for more than six candidates for supervisor you can get a replacement ballot.

If you move, you must re-register. The most common complaint we get on election day is that someone can't vote because they have moved and not re-registered. If you have moved, your name will probably not be on the rolls anymore and even if it is, it is not legal to vote using your old polling place (except in certain rare circumstances). Next time you move, don't leave your vote behind; remember to re-register.

You don't have to be sick or out-of-town to get an absentee ballot. Any voter can request an absentee ballot for any reason, or for no reason. To become a "permanent" absentee voter you must be disabled but ordinary absentee voters do not have to have a reason.

Your registration will not necessarily be cancelled if you don't vote but chances of that happening will increase if you don't vote. After the election, we will send a postcard confirming the address of all nonvoters. If the Post Office or the current resident says you don't live there anymore, your registration will be cancelled. No one is automatically cancelled for not voting at any election.

It is not necessary to re-register before each election. Your registration is permanent and will remain in effect until you move, die or are convicted of a felony.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

STEP 1

Notas: Si hace algunos errores, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

D 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

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 coincidan con los dos cabecitas rojas.

D 第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票足之二孔，对应于二红色之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL [STRAIGHT UP]. PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
请把带针之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

D 第四步
投票选票之后，把选票取出，放入空封袋内，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格供做投票人应用。
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name

Address ____________________________ Apt. # ___

Telephone No. (required) ____________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): ____________________________

Second choice locations (if any) ____________________________

Signature ____________________________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APPLICATION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota a la dirección:

Mailing address, if different from above:
Dirección Postal (si es diferente):

EXTRA APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Since this page would have been blank anyway, we have used the space to reprint an extra copy of the absentee ballot application form.

Your "real" absentee ballot application appears as a postcard inserted into this book. We would prefer that you use the postcard form because it is easier to process and less likely to get lost.

If two persons in your household are requesting absentee ballots, you may put both postcard forms into an envelope in order to save postage.

The disabled may apply as permanent absentee voters by completing the little box at the bottom of the form. Disabilities that qualify for permanent absentee status include circulatory problems and mobility impairments as well as more severe disabilities.

If you have not yet received your absentee ballot, then you are probably not on our permanent absentee mailing list. The permanent absentee voters' ballots were mailed out the week of October 9th.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALLOT TYPE</th>
<th>GENERAL ELECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 3</td>
<td>5th Congressional District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Senate District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19th Assembly District (BART)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application for absentee ballot appears on Page 48
Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊在第48頁

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.