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For Assessor
MILTON C. JOHNSON

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Assessor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 8, 1966, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office:

That my name is Milton C. Johnson. My residence address is at No. 1230 Monterey Blvd., San Francisco. My business or occupation is owner, automobile radio business.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I have lived in San Francisco 33 years, am a family man with five children, operate my own business, am active in community affairs, a Scout Master and Navy veteran. I own residential and commercial property. My purpose is to see that the people of San Francisco receive fair and equitable tax assessment. Tax reforms should be instituted which will encourage people to improve their property without fear of excessive tax increases. Tax relief should be given to retired people living within fixed incomes. Changes should be considered in the personal property tax and commercial floor tax assessments.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "independent business man" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 8, 1966.

Signature of Candidate: MILTON C. JOHNSON.

Subscribed before me and filed this 16th day of September, 1966.

CHAS. A. ROGERS
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The Sponsors for Milton C. Johnson are:

Harriet R. Johnson, 1230 Monterey Blvd., Housewife.
Minette L. Flynn, 211 Evelyn Way, Housewife.
Laura J. Howard, 3628 Broderick St., Businesswoman.
Wilbur W. Howard, 3628 Broderick St., Businessman.
Alice M. Johnson, 129 Warren Drive, Housewife.
Charles P. Johnson, 129 Warren Drive, Retired Businessman.
Anna M. Rupke, 1124 Leavenworth St., Housewife.
Elizabeth June Shafer, 239 Grattan St., Teacher.
John F. Shafer, 3622 Baker St., Hotel Keeper.
Theodore W. Shafer, 239 Grattan St., Post Office Dept.
Larry W. Teshare, 801 Darien Way, Teacher.
Mrs. Laura K. Williams, 190 O'Shaughnessy Blvd., Housewife.
For Assessor

ROBERT H. MERSEREAU

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Assessor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 8, 1966, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office:

That my name is Robert H. Mersereau. My residence address is at No. 7026 Fulton Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Slumlord.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Author of "Mersereau plan" which states: "Assessed value" is a gimmick to rob the taxpayer. Is a fraud. As Assessor I will eliminate "assessed value" and hence the office of Assessor. The property tax base will be "full cash value" as determined each January first by mailed in, sworn statement of taxpayer. If over stated, excess tax would be paid. If under stated, selling price would be weakened. Figure would also be subject to inspection and correction by Tax Collector or authorized agent. Now as always insofar as voting has meaning, we San Franciscans get who and what we vote for.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Slumlord" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 8, 1966.

Signature of Candidate: ROBERT H. MERSEREAU.

Subscribed before me and filed this 12th day of September, 1966.

CHAS. A. ROGERS
Registrar of Voters.
By P. LEMONE,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The Sponsors for Robert H. Mersereau are:

Miroslav Djordjevich, 373 Rolph St., Manager.
William J. Neles, 368 Christopher Drive, Real Estate Broker.
Steve M. Jeong, 146 Wood St., Apt. 8, Accountant.
Joseph H. Jackson, 1127 Wisconsin St., Advertising Executive.
Mary S. Gessert, 70-27th Ave., Housewife.
George W. Gessert, 70-27th Ave., Retired.
Oscar McNerny, 801 Sutter St., Retired U. S. Civil Service.
Maurine G. Koltugin, 888 Chestnut St., Housewife.
Omer A. Fournier, 900 Powell St., Apt. 1, Retired.
Adrien A. Voisin, 881 Innes Ave., Sculptor.
James L. Sharp, 2945 Scott St., Programmer.
Svend Petersen, 241 Winding Way, Clerk.
Andrew W. Thompson, 391 Sutter St., Building Superintendent.
Marshall S. Sanders, 123 Stratford Drive, Insurance Broker.
For Assessor

SCOTT M. SHELDON

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Assessor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 8, 1966, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office:

That my name is Scott M. Sheldon. My residence address is at No. 37 Sheldon Terr., San Francisco. My business or occupation is property owner.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: As a property owner I believe that the affairs of the office should be conducted impartially and without political consideration. This is a non-political office and I am dedicated to the continuance of a strict non-political administration by an administrator chosen by the people, not appointed. I believe confiscatory taxes must be stopped and with the new 25% assessment of property values, taxes will rise beyond the ability to pay. I believe all tax payers should be made aware of their rights in protecting their homes. We need a balanced tax system and a ready ear to all suggestions and complaints.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation ‘Property Owner’ be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 8, 1966.

Signature of Candidate: SCOTT M. SHELDON.

Subscribed before me and filed this 20th day of September, 1966.

CHAS. A. ROGERS
Registrar of Voters.

By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The Sponsors for Scott M. Sheldon are:

Mrs. Betty M. Sheldon, 37 Sheldon Terrace, Housewife.
Janice Arenson, 1835-26th Ave., Secretary.
Duane Climo, 1945-15th Ave., Student and Office Manager.
Lillian Heiser, 506-47th Ave., Homemaker.
Helen V. Hoffman, 1831-32nd Ave., Homemaker.
Grace Liu, 765 Noriega St., Housewife.
Shih C. Liu, 795 Noriega St., Physician & Surgeon.
Bessie R. Lobree, 31 Sheldon Terrace, Retired Housewife.
Valerie H. Scholten, 314 Surrey St., Housewife.
Frieda Shapiro, 211 Morningside Dr., Housewife.
Marvin L. Sheldon, 37 Sheldon Terrace, Real Estate Broker.
Allen L. Sutter, 625 Burnett Ave., Partner—Insurance Broker.
Doris Sutter, 625 Burnett Ave., Partner—Insurance Broker.
Richard A. Sutter, 625 Burnett Ave., P-3, Banking.
Ray Zimmerman, 801 Noriega St., Housewife.
For Assessor
DOROTHY SHINDER

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Assessor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 8, 1966, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office:

That my name is Dorothy Shinder. My residence address is at No. 1692A Green Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Tax Reform Lobbyist.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Tax Deductible Rents for apartment dwellers, etc.; they are "Homereinters." Tax Deductible Depreciation and Expenses for Homeowners. Justification: 1. Redevelopment—Public Funds subsidize wealthy landlords, unequal distribution of tax dollars. 2. Public officials in real estate, banking; encouraged real estate, title company combines raising property cash value, assessments, rents. 3. Existing protective laws not administered—conflict of interest. 4. My petitions, letters, urging rent-real estate restraints to protect homeowners, renters; pleas for investigation, ignored by local, state, federal officials. Minnesota University, San Francisco State; 10 years San Francisco legal; President, National Tax Reform Lobby; Director, "Our Homes Are Rented Apartments"; Prevents unjustifiable rent increases; research, writer, lecturer.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Tax Reform Lobbyist" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 8, 1966.

Signature of Candidate: DOROTHY SHINDER.

Subscribed before me and filed this 19th day of September, 1966.
CHAS. A. ROGERS
Registrar of Voters.
By HAROLD J. O’DONNELL,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The Sponsors for Dorothy Shinder are:
Belle R. Albert, 975 North Point St., Secretary.
Lucile Anderson, 1923 Vallejo St., Secretary
Bertha Ast, 1809 Fox Plaza, 1390 Market St., Attorney.
Ethel A. Black, 445 Warren Dr., Administrative Assistant.
Leta A. Durant, 1270 La Playa St., Retired.
J. M. Elliott, 325 West Portal Ave., Account Executive.
Janet E. Gleave, 1690 Filbert St., #2, State Civil Service Clerk.
Mary C. Hansen, 2133 A Larkin St., Calculating Machine Operator.
Mahala Hartman, 835 Turk St., Retired.
Evangelina Herndon, 3335 Octavia St., Apt. 302, Intermediate Stenographer.
Walla S. Hubbard, 734 Bush St., Apt. 41, Teacher.
Phyllis M. Mahoney, 3335 Octavia St., Bookkeeper.
J. A. Olson, 1490 Jefferson St., Investment Accountant.
Alfred W. O'Neill, 440 Eddy St., Clerk.
Irene M. Singleton, 744 Lake St., Secretary.
Louisa Stanton, 2146 Van Ness Ave., Apt. 6, Clerk.
Lenore V. Wilkins, 1856 Powell St., Legal Secretary.
For Assessor

JOSEPH E. TINNEY

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Assessor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 8, 1966, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Joseph E. Tinney. My residence address is at No. 1 Melba Ave., San Francisco. My business or occupation is Assessor, City and County of San Francisco.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Prior to appointment as Assessor, I was Member and President, Board of Supervisors; Member, President, City Planning Commission; Assistant District Attorney. Born Mission District; graduated Junipero Serra, St. Paul’s, St. Ignatius, U. S. F. where I taught law school; engaged in law practice. I share homeowners’ concern over increasing property tax burden. I will urge repeal of the tax on household furniture and take whatever other steps necessary to assure fair and equal treatment for all taxpayers. Homeowners will be assured that certain repairs can be made to their property without an increase in assessed value. Affiliations: N.S.G.W., Elks, Moose, A.O.I.I., W.O.W., Spanish Speaking Citizens, Booker T. Washington, S. F. Bar.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Incumbent” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 8, 1966.

Signature of Candidate: JOSEPH E. TINNEY.

Subscribed before me and filed this 14th day of September, 1966.

CHAS. A. ROGERS
Registrar of Voters.

The Sponsors for Joseph E. Tinney are:

Walter A. Haas, 2100 Pacific Ave., Manufacturer.
Joseph P. Mazzola, 127 Lakeshore Drive, Manager Plumbers & Steamfitters Local 38.
Julia G. Porter, 142-27th Ave., Housewife.
Don Fazackerley, 170 El Verano Way, Banker.
Gardner W. Mein, 2307 Broadway, Executive.
Mrs. John B. Molinari, 1262 Lombard St., Housewife.
Timothy J. Twomey, 2026 Lawton St., Labor Union Representative.
Dr. Hamilton T. Boswell, 45 Cleary Court, Clergyman.
Carmen J. Dominguez, 124 Garrison St., Attorney.
Adolfo Majewsky, 11 Athens St., Realtor and Director Spanish Speaking Citizens Foundation.
Daniel F. Del Carlo, 50 Chumasero Dr., Apt. 7K, Labor Representative.
Joseph J. Diviny, 125 Cambon Dr., Int’l Vice Pres., Teamsters Union.
John F. Fixa, 45 Cleary Court, Retired Postmaster of San Francisco, Calif.
Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 930 Chestnut St., Insurance Company Executive.
Louis T. Kruger, 31 Miguel St., Attorney-at-Law.
Francis Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Merchant.
Malachy Ruane, 250 College Ave., Contractor.
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Buchanan YMCA Executive Secretary.
H. L. Zellerbach, 2288 Broadway, Executive.
For Public Defender

EDWARD T. MANCUSO

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Public Defender for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 8, 1966, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Edward T. Mancuso. My residence address is at No. 520 Crestlake Drive, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Attorney at Law.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Since my appointment as Public Defender in 1954, I have been reelected to office 3 times by the citizens of San Francisco by overwhelming votes, expressing confidence in my administration. The San Francisco Public Defender’s office has gained national recognition as an efficient and successful one. My staff of attorneys, experienced in criminal law, devote full time to their duties and responsibilities in representing indigents accused of crime. I earnestly desire to continue serving the citizens of San Francisco as their Public Defender in the same tradition and respectfully ask for your vote of confidence.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Incumbent” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 8, 1966.

Signature of Candidate: EDWARD T. MANCUSO.

Subscribed before me and filed this 12th day of September, 1966.

CHAS. A. ROGERS
Registrar of Voters.
By HAROLD J. O’DONNELL,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The Sponsors for Edward T. Mancuso are:

Dorothy E. J. Mancuso, 520 Crestlake Drive, Housewife.
Dr. Robert C. Atkinson, 2475 Mission St., Optometrist.
Eugene B. Block, 2533 Turk St., Editor-Publisher.
Dr. Hamilton T. Boswell, 45 Cleary Court, Clergyman.
Henry C. Clausen, 36 San Jacinto Way, Attorney at Law.
Daniel F. Del Carlo, 50 Chumasero Drive, Labor Representative.
Louis Garcia, 370 Ellis St., Attorney.
Dr. Francis J. Herz, 2358-14th Ave., Dentist.
Ben K. Lerner, 520 El Camino del Mar, Attorney at Law.
Dan E. London, St. Francis Hotel, 335 Powell St., Corporation Executive.
Joseph P. Mazzola, 127 Lakeshore Drive, Manager, Plumbers and Steamfitters Local 38.
Robert McCarthy, 1050 Kirkham St., Retired.
William Moskovitz, 1901 California St., Retired.
Catalina E. Mulanax, 2450-45th Ave., Housewife.
Robert Nicco, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Attorney.
Angelo J. Scampini, 55 San Andreas Way, Lawyer.
Benjamin H. Swig, 950 Mason St., Hotel Operator.
Mrs. Marguerite Weisheimer, 46 Marcela Ave., Housewife.
Dr. Thomas Wu, 598-38th Ave., Doctor of Dental Surgery.
PROPOSITIONS "A" AND "B"

NOTICE OF FINAL PASSAGE

FILE NO. 311-66-1  ORDINANCE NO. 227-66

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1966, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $95,500,000 FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF AIR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; $96,500,000 FOR ADDITIONS TO AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE MUNICIPAL TRANSIT SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO: FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 8th day of November, 1966, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

(a) AIRPORT BONDS, 1966.

$95,500,000 to pay the cost of improvement of air transportation facilities of the City and County of San Francisco by additions to and improvement of the San Francisco International Airport and the construction of a heliport in San Francisco to provide an air transportation link between San Francisco and the San Francisco International Airport, including land, buildings, facilities, utilities, equipment, and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco.

(b) MUNICIPAL TRANSIT SYSTEM BONDS, 1966.

$96,500,000 to pay the cost of additions to and improvement of the municipal transit system of the City and County of San Francisco, including land, buildings, facilities, equipment, rapid transit cars, motor coaches, trolley coaches, cable cars, and all other works, property, and structures necessary or convenient for additions to and improvement of the municipal transit system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the
following resolutions and in the amounts specified:

Airport Bonds, Resolution No. 513-66—$95,500,000;
Municipal Transit System Bonds, Resolution No. 514-66—$96,500,000.

That each of said resolutions was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Acting Mayor, and in each of said resolutions it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolutions, and each thereof, are hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements, and each thereof.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 8, 1966, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or about October 18, 1966.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, each to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballots as separate propositions:

To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $95,500,000 for improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco.
(b) “Municipal Transit System Bonds, 1966.
To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $96,500,000 for additions to and improvement of the municipal transit system of the City and County of San Francisco.”

To vote for any proposition where ballots are used, and to incur the bonded indebtedness to the amount of and for the purposes stated herein, stamp a cross (x) in the blank space to the right of the word “Yes.” To vote against any proposition and thereby refuse to authorize the incurring of a bonded indebtedness to the amount of and for the purposes stated herein,
stamp a cross (x) in the blank space to the right of the word "No."

Where voting machines are used at said special election said voting machines shall be so arranged that any qualified elector may vote for any proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "Yes" under or near a statement of the proposed proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for the proposition, and by pulling down a lever over the word "No" under or near a statement of the proposed proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, shall constitute a vote against the proposition. Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with the provisions of law.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on either of said propositions voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 6 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

APPROVED AS TO FORM

THOMAS M. O'CONNOR, City Attorney

Passed for Second Reading—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, August 22, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

Read Second Time and Finally Passed—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, August 29, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

Approved September 1, 1966. JOHN F. SHELLEY, Mayor
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PROPOSITION A

Airport Bonds, 1966. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $95,500,000 for improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION 'A'

Vote "YES" on Proposition 'A'

Proposition 'A,' for the continued expansion of San Francisco International Airport, must be passed this year. The Airport must keep pace with the rapid rise in air passenger and air freight traffic. Vote YES on Proposition 'A.'

A YES vote on Proposition 'A' is a vote for continued economic growth and jobs in San Francisco.

No Tax Cost!

Proposition 'A' is tax-free. The Airport pays its own way, out of its own revenues. There is no cost to the tax-payers. There is no organized opposition to Proposition 'A.' Nevertheless, it is vitally important that you cast your YES vote, because Proposition 'A,' as a bond issue, still needs a two-thirds vote—it needs two YES votes for every NO vote.

It must pass this year because to delay would be to fall behind the rising curve of passenger and freight traffic, and would damage the Airport's economic contribution to San Francisco.

How Air Passenger Volume Has Grown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 (predicted)</td>
<td>13 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974 (predicted)</td>
<td>18 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present capacity of the Airport is about 12 million passengers. Traffic is growing at a rate of more than 1 million passengers per year.

How Air Freight Volume Has Grown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cargo (tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 (predicted)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974 (predicted)</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Proposition 'A' passes, the Airport can handle this freight volume.

Vote YES on 'A.'

What Proposition 'A' Will Do for Passengers

To expand passenger capacity, Proposition 'A' will finance the completion of the Terminal complex by building a North Terminal building that will add 20 more gate positions for incoming and departing planes—including the supersonic 500 passenger jets that will probably be operating by 1974. It will also expand the pliers at Central and South terminals.

Proposition 'A' will expand the Airport Garage to its full capacity of 8,000 cars, as planned. Proposition 'A' will add a heliport on the roof of the garage. It also provides funds for a downtown heliport.

Proposition 'A' will also increase passenger capacity, as well as passenger convenience and comfort, by adding gateway positions on the existing terminals, permit the installation of moving sidewalks for passengers and baggage, extend taxiways, add navigational aids, and provide tram service to move passengers from one terminal building to another. It will make it one of America's most modern Airports.
What Proposition ‘A’ Will Do for Freight

As for air cargo: Proposition ‘A’ will meet that demand by building an Air Cargo Center that will include roads, utilities and 600,000 square feet of warehouse space (our present capacity is only 165,000). While the Center is being built, an interim Cargo Center will be provided.

Besides all this, Proposition ‘A’ will give us a long-overdue improvement in the access roads leading to the Airport, to avoid traffic jams. You’ll be able to reach the Terminal on a perimeter road that will take cars off the Bayshore freeway, and there will be an overpass to eliminate the dangerous grade crossing at the Airport entrance.

Your Yes Vote Is Needed!

Proposition ‘A’ for $95.5 million, will pay for itself without any cost to tax-payers, and will expand our Airport to its full capacity to meet the demands of the great air travel, air shipping age.

Failure to pass it will put an unnecessary economic limit on the growth of San Francisco.

But to accomplish all this, you must Vote on Election Day—you must vote Yes on Proposition ‘A’—and be sure your neighbors do, too!

Marvin Cardoza | Co-Chairmen
George Killian | R. Gwin Folliis, Finance Chairman

Proposition "A" has been endorsed by the following:

Apartment House Associations Consolidated
Building Owners and Managers Association of San Francisco
California Northern Hotel Association
Democratic Assembly of Northern California
Down Town Association
Federated Young Democrats-San Francisco
Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Nisei Voters League
Retail Dry Goods Association of San Francisco
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Real Estate Board
San Francisco Women’s Legislative Council
The Democratic Forum
The San Francisco Municipal Conference
George W. John, Secretary. San Francisco Labor Council
Garage and Service Station Employees’ Union. Local 665
San Francisco Labor Council

Harry J. Aleo: Jack Ashby; John Barulich: Lawrence D. Becker; Josiah Beeman; Melvin M. Bell: A. Brooks Berlin: Benjamin Biagini; Harry L. Bigarani; Reginald H. Biggs; Paul A. Bisssinger; James E. Black, Jr.; Honorable Roger Boas; Peter Boudoures; Matthew J. Boxer; W. F. Bramstedt; R. L. Brandenburger; William M. Britton; Belford Brown; Henry J. Budde; Robert Cahill; Frederic Campagnoli; Honorable Joseph M. Casey; Allen E. Charles; George P. Cherakis; Wm. Jack Chow; William P. Cleek; William K. Coblentz; Arthur H. Coleman, M.D.; Reverend John A. Collins; J. E. Countryman; Curtis Day; Madlyn Smyth Day; A. F. Derre; Joseph J. Diviny; Marion F. Donahoe; Emelia M. Dutton; J. W. Ehrlich; Mrs. Morse Erskine; Honorable John A. Ertle; Adrien J. Falk; John L. Farley; Don Fazackerley; Mortimer Fleshacker; III; Thomas E. Flowers; R. Gwin Folliis; Honorable John Francis Foran; Honorable Terry Francis; Charles Louis Frankel; Louis Garcia; Henry Gibbons, III; M.D.; Bryant Gordon; Walter Gordon; Harry P. Gough; Mrs. Henry F. Grady; Stuart N. Greenberg; A. Crawford Greene; Dr. Robert Grosso; John K. Hagopian; Richard C. Ham; Gregory A. Harrison; George D. Hart; Joseph C. Haughhey; H. J. Haynes; Rev. Frederick D. Haynes; A. Hazard; Louis Hellbron; Gerald N. Hill; Charles S. Hobbs; Paul E. Hoover; Jaquelin H. Ilume; Reed O. Hunt; S. Marshall Kemper; Judge Joseph G. Kennedy; Donald B. King; William Knowles; Ted James Kukula; Roger Lapham; Dr. T. Kong Lee; Mr. & Mrs. Irwin Left: Milton K. Lepetic; Bert W. Levitt; H.R. H. Lum; Putnam Livermore; Lawrence Livingston; Dan London: Robert A. Lutie; Andrew McCabe; Honorable Leo T. McCarthy; N. Loyall McLaren; Marshall P. Madison; Cyril Magnin; J. W. Mailliard, III; William M. Malone; Honorable Thomas A.
Maloney; Alan S. Maremont; Joseph Martin, Jr.; Louis Martinelli; Walter J. Maytham; John L. Merrill; Wilson Meyer; Emerson Midyett; Joseph A. Moore; Miriam Mills Moore; Honorable Jack Morrison; Thomas Morton; Honorable George Moscone; I. C. Motheral; Mrs. Margaret R. Murray; Honorable Mae E. Nolan; Gerald J. O’Gara; Andrew Downey Orrick; Honorable Kevin O’Shea; David Packard; T. S. Petersen; Mrs. Charles B. Porter; William E. Reedy; H. Irving Rhine; Burton Rockwell; Mrs. William Lister Rogers; Henry R. Rolphi; Oliver M. Rousseau; James J. Rudden; John J. Sampson, M.D.; S. M. Saroyan; Samuel D. Sayad; Albert E. Schlesinger; Robert Setrakian; William D. Shaw; Jacob Sherman; Albert Shumate, M.D.; Emnett Solomon; Douglas Dacre Stone; Gregory Stout; Charles R. Stuart; John E. Sullivan; W. H. Sullivan, Jr.; T. T. Taam; Honorable Peter Tamaras; Eileen T. Turner; Adolfo de Urioste; Honorable Dorothy von Beroldingen; Yori Wada; James J. Walsh, Jr.; E. Hornsby Wasson; Paul L. Wattis; Caspar W. Weinberger; Thomas P. White; Harold B. Williams; Jean Witter.

On September 12, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1966, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O’Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION A

Vote “Yes” on Propositions A and B

Here, in addition to the argument for Proposition “A,” it is appropriate for the undersigned to urge upon you the importance of voting “YES” for both these vital issues. Vote “Yes” on “A” . . . Vote “Yes” on “B.”

They are related, because they both have to do with the important problem of transportation of people. Proposition “A” deals with the needs of the Airport, through which millions of people travel to and from San Francisco every year. Proposition “B” deals with the needs of the Municipal transit system, on which millions of trips are taken annually by the people of our City.

Vote “Yes” on “A.” Vote “Yes” on “B.”

They are related because they are both bond issues. Both, therefore, require a two-thirds’ vote. Both need two “Yes” votes for every “No” vote that may be cast.

Vote “Yes” on “A.” Vote “Yes” on “B.”

But, most important of all, these two issues are related because each of them is vital to the economic health of San Francisco. Our Airport must be able to accommodate the people who want to come to San Francisco, for business or pleasure. Our Muni must be able to accommodate the people of the City themselves in getting from one place to another.

Read both these ballot arguments, for “A” and for “B,” with great care. When you have, we are sure you will agree:

For San Francisco, for ourselves, we must vote YES on both “A” and “B.”

Yes on “A” . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes on “B”

This argument is sponsored by San Franciscans United for Propositions “A” and “B.”

Marvin E. Cardoza, Chairman
George Killion, Co-Chairman
R. Gwin Follis, Finance Chairman

Endorsed by:
George W. Johns, Secretary, San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Labor Council

On September 12, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1966, by the following vote:
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Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "A"

Vote NO on Tax and Rent Increases

Increased Taxes Means Increased Rents

Vote NO on Airport Bond Issue "A". Vote NO on Subsidizing San Mateo County Airport. This is only the beginning.

Huge Airport Bond Issues to Follow

This First Airport Bond Issue Is For $ 95,500,000
You Must Pay In Addition, Interest of 30,560,000

True Actual Cost $126,060,000
Bond Report States Phases 2 and 3 to follow Cost of these Bonds—Without Interest 280,000,000

Grand Total Cost For Airport $406,060,000

S.F. Taxpayers Stop Being Dupes for San Mateo County

Do you realize that while San Francisco foots all the bills, signs the checks, etc., San Mateo County is getting all the benefits? The payrolls, improvements and gains are practically all being spent in San Mateo County without their putting out one cent in return. We even pay for our own Police and Fire protection.

They even have the gall to make us pay taxes on every improvement we make for their benefit. This Bond Issue will give San Mateo County another $95,500,000 to tax us, and when Phases 2 and 3 are completed it will make for an increase to $375,000,000 for San Mateo County to tax San Francisco.

Why Subsidize Our Neighboring County?

Our Public Utilities Commission alone paid taxes to San Mateo County last year of $737,510. Imagine how this will skyrocket when the Bond Issue Improvements are made. The present tax figure was only obtained by our appeal to the State Board of Equalization to reduce the exorbitant tax bill that San Mateo County tried to collect.

We are like the cow who had two owners. One owned the front half and did all the feeding and care, and the other owned the rear half and got all the milk and cream. San Mateo County owns the rear half of this Airport Cow and is getting all the milk and cream.

If our neighboring counties Airports need expansion, we have Oakland with a perfectly new and modern airport. ready and willing to take care of future expansion, without costing the San Francisco Taxpayer one cent. Other large cities have two or more airports and there is no reason why Oakland's facilities should not be used.

Don't believe the Airport will pay its way, after we put $406,000,000 more into its costs.

Realize the Immense Tax Burdens Due to Bond Issues

Last year our Maximum Debt Limit (12%) was $286,754,583

Present Bond Redemption and Interest Owed is $249,048,399

Authorized Bond Issued (not yet sold) less interest 148,388,000

Proposed Municipal Railway Bonds, plus interest 122,508,000

Proposed Airport Bonds, plus interest 126,060,000

2nd and 3rd phases of proposed Airport expansion 280,000,000

Proposed Grand Total Bond Debt $928,014,399

Nearly A Billion Dollars In Tax Debts.

Let's Stop Supplying The Rope To Hang Ourselves.
Vote NO on Bond Profits for Wealthy Tax Evaders

While you and I must pay Federal Income taxes on our Full Income, wealthy citizens can evade paying a single dollar in Federal Income Taxes through their purchase of these city bonds. This income is 100% tax free.

Ask yourself, Who is paying for the Enormous Campaign Slush Fund to slip these bonds across with its back-breaking bond burden on our taxpayers? Also, how do they expect to reap their profit?

Stop the Big Spenders  Stop These Blank Checks

Your tax rate has jumped 44c this year to the Highest Rate in our history. Next year, the increase will be much higher. Also, next year our homes will be taxed on much higher valuations.

Vote NO on this waste of public funds. Vote NO on tax and rent increases. Vote NO on Proposition "A" Airport Bonds.

This argument is sponsored by the Home Owners and Tenants Protective Committee.

THOMAS M. DILLON, Chairman

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

PROPOSITION "A"

Airport Bonds, 1966. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $95,500,000 for improvement of air transportation facilities for the city and county of San Francisco.

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

- Bond redemption $95,500,000
- Interest requirement 30,560,000
- Total debt service requirement $126,060,000

Based upon the work program submitted by the Public Utilities Commission, the estimated average amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof would be approximately $6,300,000 annually for twenty years.

In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Airport revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION B

Municipal Transit System Bonds, 1966. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $96,500,000 for additions to and improvement of the municipal transit system of the City and County of San Francisco.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION ‘B’

The success of Proposition ‘B’ is vital to you—whether or not you ride the Municipal Railway. A good modern transit system is as important to a city as a good water supply or good fire protection.

People must be able to move easily from one part of the City to another. The vast majority of them must be able to do it on public transit—not private automobiles.
To avoid choking to death of traffic congestion, San Francisco needs the best public transit—the best Muni.

Proposition 'B' is planned to give San Francisco just that—the Best in public transit—the best Muni we have ever had. But you must vote YES on 'B' on November 8.

1: Proposition 'B' Will Keep the Muni Rolling

More than two-thirds of the funds in Proposition 'B' are allocated to new equipment and rehabilitation.

The Muni has 983 vehicles in operation—all obsolete. Not one of them is of a type still being manufactured anywhere. They must be replaced—some immediately, some within a few years. We 'cannibalize' replace parts, or we have to make them ourselves.

Vote Yes on 'B'... For a New Muni!

Our tracks date back to 1914, and need extensive repair and replacement. Our maintenance shops and garages are long overdue for repair—the Geneva car barn, which was damaged in the 1906 earthquake, is overdue for demolition.

Proposition 'B' will provide new high-speed trains to replace the outmoded streetcars; new, specially designed, smog-controlled buses, to replace the noisy, smoking old ones; new rapid transit tracks through the Twin Peaks tunnel; new or rehabilitated shops and garages.

2: Proposition 'B' Will Modernize the Muni!

The second part of Proposition 'B' offers even more, requires less than one-third of the cost.

These are the goals:
1. Make it possible to go from downtown to almost any part of the City in no more than 20 minutes.
2. Give San Francisco a local transit system that will coordinate with BARTD, and not be downgraded by BARTD. (BARTD trains start running in 1969 or 1970.)
3. Reduce pressure to build freeways through the City, by reducing automobile congestion.
4. Qualify San Francisco (whose citizens make a huge Federal tax contribution) to get some of its fair share back in Federal transit funds.
5. Give San Francisco the maximum benefit from our BARTD investment.

Proposition 'B' is the result of the most detailed transit study ever made in any city. The results told us where people want to go in San Francisco, when they want to go there, why they want to go there. Proposition 'B' is the result. Vote YES on 'B'.

The Comprehensive Transit Plan

Proposition 'B' provides the funds to build the high-speed subway line from 19th and Holloway Avenues through the Twin Peaks tunnel to Market Street. To get downtown from Twin Peaks today takes anywhere from 26 minutes to an hour and a half at the crowded hours. You never are sure how long it will take. It depends on traffic, accidents, even on change-fumblers looking for their fare. The Twin Peaks subway will provide a safe, dependable, consistent travel time of less than 14 minutes from San Francisco State College to Market and Powell.

The map shows the rest of the Comprehensive Transit Plan, including the Sunset and Richmond subways.

The Muni's Great New Bus Network

The new buses that Proposition 'B' will buy will be equipped with radio
and telemetric devices that will enable them to bring passengers to and take passengers from the subways with complete coordination.

There will be increased bus service. There will be faster and more comfortable service.

Among the additional bus routes will be two more high-speed lines—
from the Marina, and through the Bayview area. The present freeway and road system will be used to make them almost as swift as the new rapid transit subways.

**Less Crowding on the Cable Cars**

A comparatively small, but vital part of Proposition ‘B’ provides for building 5 additional cable cars, which are sorely needed; improvement of the cable car tracks, and extension of the cable car lines to Fisherman’s Wharf (getting the turntable off the roadway) and to Ferry Park (coordinating with Marin commuters).

The cable car barn, which is becoming one of our great tourist attractions, will be developed to yield additional tourist revenue for the City.

**Proposition ‘B’ Is a Bargain**

Proposition ‘B’ will get the Muni ready to hold its own when the BARTD regional trains start running. It will make it easier to work and live in San Francisco, than to work in San Francisco and live in the East Bay. Proposition ‘B’ will not take a single square foot of property off the tax rolls. (Freeways take 40 acres per mile).

More good wage-earning families will choose to live in San Francisco. Our homes will have good value, our apartment buildings will fill up, our stores and local businesses will thrive. Property values will rise. Our tax base will be strengthened.

Muni maintenance and accident cost will be reduced. Proposition ‘B’ in fact, offers us the biggest transit bargain we have ever seen. Vote Yes on ‘B’.

**Two ‘Yes’ Votes for Every ‘No’ Vote**

Proposition ‘B’ is endorsed by taxpayers, business men, labor, educators, merchants, professional men, neighborhood groups, minority groups—everyone.

Nevertheless, there are always those who will vote NO on any Proposition. There were many of these who voted against the Hetch Hetchy water plan—where would we be today without it?

These automatic No-voters must be counteracted by twice as many YES votes. Proposition ‘B’ needs a two-thirds majority. You must vote ‘Yes’—you must be sure your friends and your neighbors vote ‘Yes’.

The time has come to Build a New Muni. ‘B’ is for Building a New Muni.

**Vote Yes on Proposition ‘B’**

Marvin E. Cardoza, Chairman
George Killion, Chairman
R. Gwin Follis, Finance Chairman

Proposition “B” has been endorsed by the following:
California Northern Hotel Association
Democratic Assembly of Northern Calif.
Down Town Association
Federated Young Democrats—San Francisco
Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Mexican-American Political Association
Nisei Voters League
Parkside District Improvement Club Inc.
Jack Ashby; Alvin Baum; Lawrence D. Becker; Melvin M. Belli; A. Brooks Berlin;
San Francisco's 6-Corridor Comprehensive Transit Plan

Items starred (*) are paid for by Proposition 'B'
Items double-starred (**) are planned for Federal financing

*1. The Marina District will be served by expanded high-speed express service.
2. The Richmond District would be served by a rapid transit subway from 45th Avenue and Geary Boulevard. Stations would be at 45th, 35th, 25th, Park-Presidio, Arguello, Masonic, Divisadero, Fillmore, Van Ness, Jones, Powell, Post and Montgomery. Total running time, 14 minutes. Population served: 137,000. NOTE: An underground garage in the Park-Presidio area is planned for cars off the Golden Gate Bridge. One fare would cover Muni and parking.

3. Sunset Subway line from 19th and Irving Street to Market, with stations at 19th Avenue, 9th, Arguello, Cole, Church, Civic Center, Powell, Montgomery, and probably Davis Street. Total running time: 12 1/2 minutes. Population served, 90,000. (The dotted line indicates likely future extension as demand justifies it.)

4. Twin Peaks Subway. From 19th and Holloway Avenues to the Market Street subway stations. Stations at Holloway, Stonestown, St. Francis Circle, Forest Hill, Castro, Church, Civic Center and the rest of the Market Street stations. Running time, 14 minutes. Population served: 82,000. Proposition 'B' also provides for an underground storage and service facility for the City's Subway.

5. Mission-Alemany subway line (being built by BARTD). From Daly City, with stations at Balboa Park, Glen Park, 24th, 16th, Civic Center, Powell, and Montgomery. Running time, 14 minutes. San Francisco population served: 200,000.

6. The Bayview area will have a high-speed express bus system using the James Lick and the new Southern Embarcadero Freeways, with feeder bus service comparable to the subway lines. Population served: 66,500.

Auxiliary Feeder Bus Service: The map shows present Muni routes. Under Proposition 'B' these would be augmented, and coordinated to meet the rapid transit lines at each station with a minimum of waiting time. Cross-town routes would also be accelerated and extended.

On September 19, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet by the following vote:
Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “B”**

**Statement Against Proposition “B”—Muni Bond Issue**

Proposition “B” (the Muni Bond Issue) is one of the worst, weakest, proposals ever placed before San Francisco Voters. Its cost to you, in increased rents and taxes, will exceed $96,500,000—plus higher interest costs—and thus well over 40% annually on the City tax rate. This weak bond proposal was hastily, and very inadequately, studied for less than four months. It is in direct opposition to years of patient, constructive planning study by City Departments—as approved in 1962 by San Francisco voters.

The Muni Bond Report was first released in April 1966 with one set of capital cost figures. Then this report was doctored in public. A second edition (having the same date) was released two weeks later—with completely different cost estimates. Some cost items varied by almost 50%. There was intentionally—no identification that these two editions were radically doctored. The Report (both editions) has over 200 major errors, omissions, and flagrant examples of hasty study, bad planning, and incompetent engineering. San Francisco taxpayers have a prime case for a successful taxpayers' lawsuit against this fraudulent bond proposition.
Over Half of Proposition “B” has nothing to do with improving existing Muni transit facilities. Over $50,000,000 of this bond proposal would instead, duplicate and seriously worsen the rapid transit program already underway and being paid for by San Franciscans, through the $792,000,000 B.A.R.T. bonds. This wasteful $50,000,000 would be spent in Proposition “B” to: abandon all five existing streetcar lines (J, K, L, M & N)—force these passengers to transfer inconveniently between replacement buses and high-platform subway cars at junction points—and create a giant new railroad yard and repair shop right in the middle of Parkmerced-Stonestown-State College area! Lost forever would be the possibilities for modern subway-street cars, offering direct no-transfer express service to wide areas of San Francisco—as promised in the B.A.R.T. program and approved by San Francisco voters in 1962. All present streetcar riders would be forced to transfer between buses and subway-cars—adding 4 to 10 extra minutes to each trip!

The $792,000,000 B.A.R.T. bonds are already building full rapid transit in both the Twin Peaks and Mission transit corridors. The third major transit corridor in San Francisco is Geary-Richmond. One of the greatest weaknesses in Proposition “B” is that it does nothing for the heavy Geary-Richmond District corridor. Instead, Proposition “B” depreciates and worsens transit programs already underway, by B.A.R.T. in the Market-Twin Peaks transit corridor.

Proposition “B” promoters have promised San Francisco huge chunks of Federal transit aid—up to $400,000,000. James K. Carr’s statements on Federal transit aid have been wild and continually changing over the past five months. For the entire U. S. A. only $150,000,000 is available each year. No State can get over 12½%. Mr. Carr will be competing with 50 states, 200 cities, and over 500 agencies for these very limited Federal transit grants.

The existing Muni buses, garages and facilities can be improved without this bond issue. For years, the Muni has been leasing its buses and street cars, thus avoiding the need for bond issues.

All San Franciscans Are Urged to Vote “No” on Proposition “B”

Vote “No” on “B” to avoid massive waste of tens of millions of dollars. Vote “No” on “B” to save your existing direct streetcar service. Vote “No” on “B” to save the quality of already-programmed Muni and BART service in San Francisco. Vote “No” on “B” to save your precious tax dollars—and save San Francisco!

This argument is sponsored by Apartment House Associations Consolidated Incorporated.

LOUIS J. KRUM, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “B”

Vote NO on Tax and Rent Increases

Increased Taxes Means Increased Rents

Vote NO on Municipal Railway Bonds “B”

This First Municipal Railway Bond Issue is for $ 96,500,000

Additional Interest—Not Counted 26,008,000

Grand Total Cost of this issue $122,508,000

The Controller states annual payments will be $ 6,125,400

Annual Tax Subsidy this year 9,288,195

Tax Cost each year $ 15,413,505

Hundreds of Millions of Dollars of Bond Issues Will Follow

This is only the beginning. On a pay as you go plan, you could save $26,008,000 in interest on this Bond Issue.
Previous equipment was purchased on a Rent Purchase Agreement without costly Bond Issues.

Stop the Big Spenders—Stop These Blank Checks

Your Tax Rate has jumped 44½ this year to the Highest Rate in our history. Next year, the increase will be much larger. Also next year our homes will be taxed on much higher valuations.

You recently voted Bay Area Rapid Transit a blank check for a Billion Dollars of Tax Money. Already the cost has jumped $150,000,000 with a reduction of service. We are paying dearly for our mistake. Don't make the same mistake twice.

Realize the Immense Tax Burdens Due to Bond Issues

Last year our Maximum Debt Limit (12%) was $286,754,583
Present Bond Redemption and Interest Owed is $249,048,399
Authorized Bonds Issued (not yet sold) less interest 148,398,000
Proposed Municipal Railway Bonds, plus interest 122,508,000
Proposed Airport Bonds, plus interest 126,060,000
2nd and 3rd Phases of proposed Airport expansion 230,000,000
Proposed Grand Total Bond Debt $926,014,399
Nearly A Billion Dollars In Tax Debts.
Let's Stop Supplying The Rope To Hang Ourselves.

Vote NO on Bond Profits for Wealthy Tax Evaders

While you and I must pay Federal Income taxes on our Full Income, wealthy citizens can evade paying a single dollar in Federal Income Taxes through their purchase of these city bonds. This income is 100% tax free.

Ask yourself, WHO is paying for the Enormous Campaign Slush Fund to slip these bonds across with its back-breaking bond burden on our taxpayers? Also, how do they expect to reap their profit?

Vote NO on this waste of public funds. Vote NO on tax and rent increases. Vote NO on Proposition “B” Municipal Railway Bonds.

This argument is sponsored by the Home Owners and Tenants Protective Committee.

THOMAS M. DILLON, Chairman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “B”

Vote NO on Proposition “B”

Proposition “B” is a scheme which would revise the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit System in San Francisco as voted by the people in 1962.

Nobody’s against needed new transportation equipment for the Muni. Everybody is opposed to wasteful and unnecessary purchases and altered plans.

Proposition “B” is a calculated plan to remove forever the J, K, L, M and N Streetcar lines off the streets of San Francisco and to replace them by feeder bus service. This is a violation of the 1962 . . . $792,000,000 bond issue for Bay Area Rapid Transit as then proposed and accepted by the San Francisco voters.

The assumption that Federal Funds will be provided for the balance of the $390,000,000 program has no assurance of realization. There may be future local bond issues to complete this plan.
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Proposition "B," if passed, will increase the tax rate by 34c if there is no additional cost in interest rates. You now pay 41.7 for BART and an additional 52c for deficit Muni spending. Total cost to the taxpayer $1.27.7 minimum.

Proposition "B" proposes to purchase 75 rail rapid transit cars for $11,500,000 while the accepted plan for BART provides for our present streetcars to run in the subway as voted in 1962.

The matter of fares which will be charged has not been made clear. BART will charge 25c for local rides.

Proposition "B" was hastily thrown together, does not coordinate with our present proposed BART system, provides no figures relative to fares and only commits San Francisco to a first phase plan of utter destruction to our present but poorly equipped system.

Vote NO on Proposition "B".

This argument is sponsored by Committee To Inform Taxpayers.
MARGUERITE WARREN, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "B"

Proposition "B" is a hastily-conceived issue which will increase the tax rate nearly 40c—and raise rents. It will force over 45,000 J, K, L, M and N streetcar riders daily to transfer from subway to buses, destroying the BARTD plan which still calls for no-transfer subway-streetcar service to the end of all lines. It will not provide improved service to the Richmond District. It will put a big rail yard and shops in the Stonestown-Park Merced area. It ignores previously used pay-as-you-go leasing of buses. It ignores transit studies not yet completed for which the City is paying. We urge NO on "B."

This argument is sponsored by: Committee Against "B"—
CHARLES VERCELLI, Chairman
1182 Vallejo St.
JOHN HOLT, Secretary

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

PROPOSITION "B"

Municipal Transit System Bonds, 1966. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $96,500,000 for additions to and improvement of the municipal transit system of the city and county of San Francisco.

Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a seven and fifteen year basis, and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales and using the 1966-1967 assessment roll as the basis for calculating the effect upon the tax rate, it is my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$96,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest requirement</td>
<td>26,008,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt service requirement</td>
<td>$122,508,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon the work program submitted by the Public Utilities Commission, the estimated average amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof would be approximately $6,125,400 annually for twenty years, which amount is equivalent to thirty four and seven tenths (34.7) cents in the tax rate.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
PROPOSITION C

Amends Sections 38 and 38.01: Defines the duties and responsibilities of Bureau Fire Prevention and Public Safety. Establishes rates of pay and methods of promotion in bureau.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 38 and 38.01 thereof relating to fire prevention and fire investigation.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1906, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 38 and 38.01 thereof so that the same shall read as follows:

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

SECTION 38. The chief of department shall have jurisdiction, under the management of the fire commission, of the division of fire prevention and investigation consisting of the bureau of fire prevention and public safety and the bureau of fire investigation. He shall hold the assistant chief of the department, division of fire prevention and investigation, to the responsibility and authority for enforcement of laws and statutes of the State of California, and the charter and ordinances of the City and County of San Francisco, pertaining to matters of fire prevention and fire investigation.

The bureau of fire prevention and public safety shall inspect all hospitals, schools, places of public assemblage, and other premises regulated by Title 19 of the California Administrative Code, flammable liquid storage facilities, other hazardous occupancies as defined by the Building Code, and all occupied or vacated structures and premises to determine whether or not compliance is being had with statutes, regulations, and ordinances relative to fire prevention, fire protection and firespread control, and the protection of persons and property from fire. It shall enforce said statutes, regulations, and ordinances and shall report violations to other departments having jurisdiction.

The bureau of fire prevention and public safety shall examine the application, plans and specifications for the erection, and for alterations or repairs estimated to exceed $1,000 in cost, of any (structure or premises) hospital, school, place of public assemblage as defined in the Building Code, other premises regulated by Title 19 of the California Administrative Code, flammable liquid storage facility, or other hazardous occupancy as defined by the Building Code, subject to the statutes, regulations, and ordinances referred to in this section (.), and shall also examine the applications, plans and specifications for all structures and premises insofar as they involve the location of standpipes. The bureau of fire prevention and public safety shall by written report, filed with the ((superintendent of building inspection)) director of public works, approve such plans and specifications, or
report to said (superintendent) director of public works, the particulars wherein non-compliance exists, and upon modification of the application, plans and specifications to comply therewith, the bureau shall inform said (superintendent) director of its approval. No permit for alteration or repair exceeding $1,000 in cost of any hospital, school, place of public assemblage as defined in the Building Code, other premises regulated by Title 19 of the California Administrative Code, flammable liquid storage facility, or other hazardous occupancy as defined by the Building Code, or for the erection thereof, or involving the location of standpipes, shall be issued unless said approval is given.

Any structure or premises as provided in this Section 38, wherein there exists any violation of statutes ((and)) regulations, or ordinances referred to in this section, or which is maintained or used in such manner as to endanger persons or property by hazard or fire, explosion or panic and any structure or premises as provided in this Section 38 hereafter constructed, altered or repaired in violation of said statutes ((and)) regulations, or ordinances, is hereby declared to be a public nuisance, and it shall be the duty of the bureau of fire prevention and public safety to prosecute abatement proceedings.

The bureau of fire prevention and public safety shall detail to the department of public works such personnel as necessary to review and check plans relative to requirements of the Fire Code and shall report any particulars of non-compliance to the director.

The fire department shall make recommendations to the director of public works for possible revisions to the Building Code and Housing Code on matters of fire safety.

This section shall become effective on the first day of the month immediately following the date of ratification.

SECTION 38.01. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 38 of the charter, the following ranks are hereby established within the fire department as of July 1, 1953; captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety; lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety; lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation; inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety; and investigator, bureau of fire investigation. Any member of the fire department now assigned as captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, or investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall, if he has been performing such duties on July 1, 1952 and continuously thereafter for the period of one year, or for a period of one year from July 1, 1951 to July 1, 1952 inclusively, be declared permanently appointed to such rank as if appointed thereto after examination and certification from a list of eligibles under the civil service provisions of this charter, and thereafter shall hold such position under the civil service provisions of this charter; provided that as to any member assigned to either of said bureaus who is or was on military leave during any of the periods of time above stated such military leave shall be considered as service in the assignment from which leave was granted.

((Vacancies existing in the several ranks established by this section shall be subject to competitive examination, and the provisions of section 146 of the charter relating to the fire department shall apply except as otherwise provided herein. Personnel of the fire department eligible to par-
participate in an examination for the rank of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety shall come from the rank of captain. Personnel of the fire department eligible to participate in examinations for the rank of lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation shall come from the rank of lieutenant. Personnel of the fire department eligible to participate in examinations for the rank of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety and investigator, bureau of fire investigation shall come from the ranks of hoseman, truckman and chief’s operator. Nothing in this section shall prohibit captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety nor captain from participating in an examination for the rank of battalion chief. Nothing in this section shall prohibit lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety nor lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation nor lieutenant from participating in an examination for the rank of captain. The ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety and investigator, bureau of fire investigation shall be considered equal with the ranks of chief’s operator, hoseman and truckman for promotional examination to the rank of lieutenant.}

Vacancies occurring in the several ranks established by this section shall be subject to competitive examination, and the provisions of section 146 of the charter relating to the fire department shall apply except as otherwise provided herein. Personnel of the fire department eligible to participate in examinations for the rank of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, shall come from the ranks of lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation. Personnel of the fire department eligible to participate in examinations for the rank of lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall come from the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation. Personnel of the fire department eligible to participate in examinations for the rank of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall come from the ranks of hoseman, truckman and chief’s operator. Officers and members of the bureau of fire prevention and public safety and officers and members of the bureau of fire investigation are not eligible to participate in promotional examinations for the ranks other than those ranks provided for the bureau of fire prevention and public safety and bureau of fire investigation.

Fifteen percent of the total credits allowed for any promotive examination shall be allowed for seniority of service, which credits shall be distributed as follows:

a) For promotion to the rank of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation:

One percent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the fire department until the maximum of fifteen percent is reached;

b) For promotion to the rank of lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation:

Six-tenths of one percent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the fire department until a total of nine percent is reached; and in addition thereto there shall be allowed six-tenths of one percent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination for each year of service in the rank of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire in-
vestigation, until a total of six percent of the credits of the entire examination is reached;

c) For promotion to the rank of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety:

Six-tenths of one percent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the fire department until a total of nine percent is reached; and in addition thereto there shall be allowed six-tenths of one percent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination for each year of service in the ranks of lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, until a total of six percent of the credits of the entire examination is reached.

((The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation shall be $20.00 per month in addition to the amounts provided for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in section 36.2 of the charter. 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 for the rank of chief’s operator as provided in section 36.2 of the charter.))

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, 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 section 36.2 of the charter. 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 section 36.2 of the charter. The rates of compensation 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 provisions of this section shall be effective on the first day of the month immediately following the date of ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature and the adjusted basic rates of compensation computed as above provided shall be effective on that date and shall be paid for the remainder of the 1966-1967 fiscal year.

The board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance for the fiscal year 1966-1967 to include the provisions necessary for paying the adjusted basic rates of compensation herein provided.

Ordered submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

Noses: Supervisor Blake,

I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
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ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION C

Vote Yes on Proposition “C”... “C” for Consolidation

To get a building permit in San Francisco today, you must wander through a maze of City Hall offices, wait outside doors for hours and even come back week after week to see if your permit is ready. Now is the time to speed up this lengthy process and place all of the various building permit plan checkers under one roof.

Vote Yes on Proposition “C”... For Better Public Service

Your Yes vote on Proposition “C” will speed up the handling of these building permits which are necessary for every property owner and renter in San Francisco.

Vote Yes on Proposition “C”... Cut the Red Tape at City Hall

Contractors and union members begin a job soon after a building permit is issued. But, every day permits are delayed at City Hall means men don’t work and interest rates and rents climb on property. Vote Yes on Proposition “C” so that city employees can provide the proper service when they process these permits.

Vote Yes on Proposition “C” and eliminate needless costly delays which result in a loss of potential tax revenue, in added interest costs on loans, in lost time and jobs.

Vote Yes on Proposition “C” and insure that the healthy quality of the physical buildings of San Francisco—homes and businesses—is maintained. When a San Franciscan wants to remodel his home, he should not have to chase around Civic Center trying to get a permit. Yet, today when you apply for a building permit you must file at the Central Permit Bureau, 450 McAllister Street. This permit application then goes to a district inspector for the Bureau of Building Inspection. After the district inspector has signed the application, it goes to the Department of City Planning at 100 Larkin Street, then to the Fire Department in City Hall, then it may have to go to the Public Health Department at 101 Grove Street, and finally back to the Bureau of Building Inspection at 450 McAllister.

And, it is almost impossible for you to find out how much longer it will take before they give you the permit. Your Yes vote will stop the “huck passing.”

Vote Yes on Proposition “C”... For Better Public Service

Your Yes vote on Proposition “C” will speed your permit application through the plan-checking process.

Proposition “C” will also clearly define the lines of authority between the various agencies interpreting the codes affecting construction in San Francisco. The first step toward consolidation of City permit and plan-checking services into one agency is the passage of the amendments to Sections 38 and 38.01. Section 38 defines the powers, functions, and duties of the Fire Department, and makes possible a consolidated permit and plan-checking agency. Section 38.01 provides a better method for setting the compensation of fire inspectors. This will eliminate costly duplication of work and reduce the number of inspectors visiting property owners and tenants. During building or remodeling, homeowners and builders will deal with one agency rather than several as is now the case.

Today, in some cases two agencies share equal authority over some code sections, which often result in one bureau telling you one thing and another bureau says the opposite. Vote Yes on Proposition “C” and stop
the expensive conflict between the departments which hurts all San Franciscans.

Proposition "C" will increase life safety within the City and County because it will free more fire inspectors for the necessary task of maintaining safety in buildings. These inspections not only result in a safer city but serve to hold down the cost of your fire insurance. Your Yes vote on Proposition "C" will upgrade the Bureau of Fire Prevention and Public Safety within the Fire Department.

Vote Yes on Proposition "C" and insure the lives of San Franciscans, the future physical health of your city, and create more efficient government in San Francisco.

There is no organized opposition to this Charter Amendment. The following, among others, urge you to vote Yes on Proposition "C":

Mayor John F. Shelley
Thomas J. Mellon, Chief Administrative Officer
American Institute of Architects, Northern California Chapter
American Society of Civil Engineers, San Francisco Section
Apartment House Associations, Cons.
Associated Home Builders, Inc.
Building Owners and Managers Association
California Northern Hotel Association
The Democratic Forum
Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union No. 6
Retail Dry Goods Association of San Francisco
San Francisco Council of District Merchants Association
San Francisco Electrical Contractors Association, Inc.
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798
San Francisco Hotel Association
San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Municipal Conference
San Francisco Real Estate Board
Down Town Association
Retail Merchants Association
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
George W. Johns, Secretary, San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Labor Council
Plumbing, Heating, Cooling Contractors of San Francisco, Inc.
Associated General Contractors (Northern and Central California Chapter)

On September 12, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1966, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

PROPOSITION "C"

Amends Sections 38 and 38.01: Defines the duties and responsibilities of bureau fire prevention and public safety. Establishes rates of pay and methods of promotion in bureau.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it is estimated that the annual increase in the cost of government, based on the 1966-1967 salary levels, would be approximately $36,544.00

Based on the 1966-1967 assessment roll, said amount of $36,544.00 is equivalent to twenty one hundredths (0.21) of one cent in the tax rate.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
PROPOSITION D

Amends Section 151.4: Provides that employees with ten or more years service shall be allowed an annual vacation of twenty working days.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said City and County by amending Section 151.4 relating to annual vacation of employees.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1966, a proposal to amend the charter of said City and County by amending Section 151.4 thereof to read as follows:

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

Annual Vacation of Employees

Section 151.4. Every person employed in the city and county service shall be allowed a vacation with pay annually as long as he continues in his employment, as follows:

(1) After one year's continuous service, ten working days.
(2) After five years' continuous service, fifteen working days.
(3) After ten years' continuous service, twenty working days.

The effective date of this section shall be January 1, 1967.

Ordered submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "D"

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "D"

City employees lag behind their fellow employees in both private industry and other public jurisdictions in working conditions and fringe benefits. Comparative studies and surveys indicate clearly that a serious lag exists concerning vacation privileges.

Under current Charter provisions, City employees have not enjoyed a change in vacation privileges since 1949. At that time, the voters authorized 15 working days’ annual vacation after 5 years’ service. Since that date, significant improvements in vacation benefits have been widespread throughout private industry and other public jurisdictions.

For example, in private industry in the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area, the proportion of employees covered by contracts with a four-week vacation clause rose from 22 per cent in 1961 to over 40 per cent in 1965. Studies show that 71 per cent of these employees earn four weeks’ annual vacation after serving 20 years or less.

On the government side, surveys conducted by the County Supervisors’ Association and the League of California Cities show that San Francisco’s
employees lag considerably behind their counterparts in other public jurisdictions.

For example, Federal employees in San Francisco enjoy 20 working days annual vacation after only 3 years' service. California State employees enjoy vacation privileges ranging from 15 days after 3 years' service to 24 days after 20 years' service.

Bay Area counties, notably Alameda, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara Counties, after varying periods of service, also provide 20 working days' vacation to their employees. Los Angeles and San Diego Counties also similarly provide 20 working days' vacation privileges for their employees.

Finally, among California's largest cities, San Francisco runs a poor second. Los Angeles City, San Diego City, Sacramento, San Jose, Long Beach City, and several other more populous cities, accord their employees 20 working days' vacation after specified years of service.

In short, the proposed amendment will accomplish one singular fact: To bring San Francisco into line with current vacation practices in both private industry and other public jurisdictions. Standing still since 1949, only now, after 17 years, is the first change in vacation privileges requested of the voters.

The record is quite clear that this proposed amendment is fair and reasonable, one which will erase a serious inequity and will restore vacation parity with private industry and other public jurisdictions.

**Vote “Yes” on Proposition “D”**

This argument is sponsored by the Municipal Improvement League representing the following City employee unions and associations:

- American Federation of Technical Engineers, Local 11
- Automotive Machinists No. 1305
- Civil Service Association
- Civil Service Building Maintenance Union, Local 66A
- Civil Service Per Diem Men's Association of San Francisco
- Cooks, Pastry Cooks & Assistants, Local 44
- Deputy Sheriffs' Association, Inc.
- Federation of Public Employees
- Hospital and Institutional Workers Union, Local 250
- International Union of Operating Engineers, Stationary, Local 39
- Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco
- San Francisco City & County Employees Union, Local 400
- San Francisco City & County Employees, Local 747
- San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
- San Francisco Federation of Teachers, Local 61
- San Francisco Fire Fighters, Local 796
- San Francisco Police Officers' Association
- Staff Council, Bureau of Public Health Nursing
- Transport Workers Union, Local 250-A

**Proposition “D” is endorsed by:**

George W. Johns, Secretary, San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Labor Council

On September 12, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1966, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Franzoils, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “D”**

**Vote “No” on “D”—This Is an Extravagant Proposition**

Proposition “D” would give city employees 4 weeks vacation after 10 years of service. This is far more than most public and private plans. Do
you receive four weeks paid vacation?

A common provision in city and county plans is 4 weeks after 20 years. Prop. "D" would cost over a half million dollars a year, according to the controller's report. This is probably a low estimate as hundreds of new jobs are being added to the payroll.

A NO VOTE ON "D" IS A VOTE AGAINST EXTRAVAGANCE.

This argument is sponsored by The San Francisco Municipal Conference.  
LLOYD E. GRAYBIEL, Chairman

The San Francisco Municipal Conference is composed of the following organizations:
- Apartment House Associations
- Consolidated, Inc.
- Building Owners and Managers Assn.
- California Northern Hotel Assn.
- Down Town Association
- San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
- San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce
- San Francisco Real Estate Board

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION "D"

Amends Section 151.4: Provides that employees with ten or more years service shall be allowed an annual vacation of twenty working days.

Based upon reports prepared and submitted to this office by the various departments of the City, and based on current salary levels, it is estimated that the annual cost of government would increase approximately $598,243.

Of the above amount, $555,447 will affect the tax rate and, based on the 1966-67 assessment roll, it is equivalent to three and fifteen hundredths (3.15) cents in the tax rate annually.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION E

Amends Sections 35.5.1 and 36.2: Permits Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide longevity pay for policemen and firemen and overtime, night or specialized service pay to all ranks. Limits maximum amount that may be provided.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Sections 35.5.1 and 36.2 thereof, relating to rates of compensation of members of the police and fire departments.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified voters of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1966, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Sections 35.5.1 and 36.2 thereof, so that the same shall read as follows:

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

Section 35.5.1. Not later than the 15th day of February of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 100,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census.
Not later than the 1st day of April of each year, the board of supervisors shall have 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 35.5 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective on the 1st day of July next following.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance:

(a) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall not exceed the highest rate of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission;

(b) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same amount of adjustment as that used in fixing the rates of compensation for the fourth year of service for the same class;

(c) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same per cent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(d) 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.

Not later than the 2nd Monday of July of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors the rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen on the 1st day of July of that year in the cities hereinbefore referred to. The board of supervisors shall thereupon have the power by ordinance to revise all of the rates of compensation as in this section provided. Said revised rates shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the then current fiscal year.

If the board of supervisors revises said rates of compensation, then it shall, not later than the 25th day of July of the then current fiscal year, 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 salary ordinance and the annual appropriation ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for the then current fiscal year.

(On ratification of this section, the civil service commission shall immediately survey and certify to the board of supervisors the rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen on the 1st day of January, 1952, in the cities referred to hereinbefore. The board of supervisors shall thereupon have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to adjust the rates of compensation for the fiscal year 1952-1953 for all of said members of the police department based upon said certified report and as in this section provided; and, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance for the fiscal year 1952-1953 to include the provisions necessary for paying said rates from July 1, 1952; provided, if ad-
ditional funds are required, then provision shall be made for such payment out of such funds as the controller certifies are available for the purpose. Such funds as are made available shall first be applied to the payment of compensation for the period from the effective date of this section to June 30, 1953, and thereafter to the payment of such compensations for the period from the effective date of this section to July 1, 1952, and shall only apply to those persons who are members of the department on or after the effective date of this section.)

The expression "rates of compensation," as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation."

Working benefits (and premium pay differentials of any type) shall be allowed or paid to members of the 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 and, with the addition of fifteen dollars per month now provided in section 35.5 of the charter with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 168.1.1.)

The board of supervisors may, by ordinance, provide that members of the police department in the rank of police officer, police patrol driver, and women protective officer shall receive longevity compensation which shall not exceed the highest amount of longevity compensation paid to police officers and/or firemen employed in other departments of cities of 100,000 population or over in the State of California as established by the latest federal census performing substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers in the San Francisco police department. The board of supervisors may also, by ordinance, provide that members of the uniformed force of the police department shall receive overtime, night and/or split shift pay for specialized services or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever which shall not exceed the highest amounts paid in each and all of the categories aforementioned to members of the uniformed forces of other departments of cities of 100,000 population or over in the State of California as established by the latest federal census.

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, and compensation earnable as used in section 168.1.1 and shall be limited to basic amount of wages with included range scales and longevity payment and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by way of holidays, vacation, 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 differential of any type whatsoever and with the addition of fifteen dollars per month now provided in section 35.5 of the charter with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty.
For all purposes of the retirement system, the first adjustment of rates of compensation made by the board of supervisors after the effective date of this section shall be the rates of compensation for the members affected for the remainder of the fiscal year 1952-1953 following the month in which the ordinance making such adjustment becomes effective and the annual compensations set forth in section 35.5 shall be rates of compensation for said retirement purposes for the period from the beginning of the fiscal year 1952-1953 through said month.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 100,000 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.

Section 36.2. Not later than the 15th day of February of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments in all cities of 100,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census.

Not later than the 1st day of April of each year, 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 sections 36 and 38.1 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective on the 1st day of July next following.

The rates of compensation fixed in said ordinance,

(a) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for firemen shall not exceed the highest rate of compensation paid firemen in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission;

(b) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall include the same amount of adjustment as that used in fixing the rates of compensation for the fourth year of service for the same class;

(c) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same per cent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(d) 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.

Not later than the 2nd Monday of July each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors the rates of compensation paid firemen on the 1st day of July of that year in the cities hereinbefore referred to. The board of supervisors shall thereupon have the power by ordinance to revise all of the rates of compensation as in this section provided. Said revised rates shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the then current fiscal year.

If the board of supervisors revises said rates of compensation, then it shall, not later than the 25th day of July of the then current fiscal year, 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 salary ordinance and the annual appropriation ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for the then current fiscal year.

((On ratification of this section, the civil service commission shall immediately survey and certify to the board of supervisors the rates of compensation paid firemen on the 1st day of January, 1952, in the cities referred to hereinbefore. The board of supervisors shall thereupon have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to adjust the rates of compensation for the fiscal year 1951-1953 for all of said members of the fire department based upon said certified report and as in this section provided; and, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance for the fiscal year 1952-1953 to include the provisions necessary for paying said rates from July 1, 1952; provided, if additional funds are required, then provision shall be made for such payment out of such funds as the controller certifies are available for the purpose. Such funds as are made available shall first be applied to the payment of compensation for the period from the effective date of this section to June 30, 1953, and thereafter to the payment of such compensations for the period from the effective date of this section to July 1, 1952, and shall only apply to those persons who are members of the department on or after the effective date of this section.))

The expression “rates of compensation,” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation.”

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

((For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation,” as used in this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 and “compensation earnable” as used in section 171.1.1.))

The board of supervisors may, by ordinance, provide that members of the fire department in the rank of fireman shall receive longevity compensation which shall not exceed the highest amount of longevity compensation paid to firemen and/or police officers employed in other departments of cities of 100,000 population or over in the State of California as established by the latest federal census performing substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by firemen in the San Francisco fire department. The board of supervisors may also, by ordinance, provide that members of the uniformed force of the fire department shall receive overtime, night and/or split shift pay for specialized services or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever which shall not exceed the highest amounts paid in each and all of the categories aforementioned to members of the uniformed forces of other departments of cities of
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100,000 population or over in the State of California as established by the latest federal census.

For all purposes of the retirement system the expression "rates of compensation," as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to rank," as used in section 169, and "compensation earnable" as used in section 171.1.1 and shall be limited to basic amount of wages with included range scales and longevity payment and does not include such working benefits as might be set up 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 differential of any type whatsoever.

(For all purposes of the retirement system, the first adjustment of rates of compensation made by the board of supervisors after the effective date of this section shall be the rates of compensation for the members affected for the remainder of the fiscal year 1952-1953 following the month in which the ordinance making such adjustment becomes effective, and the annual compensations set forth in section 36 shall be the rates of compensation for said retirement purposes for the period from the beginning of the fiscal year 1952-1953 through said month.)

The term "firemen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 100,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

Ordered Submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "E"

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "E"

There is no provision in the Charter at present to enable policemen or firemen to be paid for overtime and/or longevity. It must be made clear that this measure is merely enabling legislation which would allow the Board of Supervisors to make adjustments, but any fringe benefit cannot exceed comparable benefits paid in other cities of 100,000 or more population.

Longevity pay for firemen and/or patrolmen is nothing more than a method of encouraging career service in the lowest rank. All members of the departments cannot be promoted, and as a result, many men are leaving this career service for more rewarding occupations.

San Francisco Fire and Police Departments are the only major departments in the area not paid premium for overtime.

At the present, there are very few occupations which do not pay premium as this is now considered a must for salaried employees.

The thankless job performed during the night hours pays the same as the work done in the light of the sun. The countless hours that these people spend separated from their families can be somewhat softened by
night premium pay for policemen. This condition has long been recognized in private employment and is made a part of their working agreement.

In order to recruit and retain the type of men you desire to look after your safety and security, you should be willing to provide your city government the means of recruiting the highest caliber available.

Proposition "E" simply allows the Board of Supervisors a discretion to provide compensation for the above-mentioned conditions.

Should 1966 firemen and policemen work under 1866 conditions? We believe not! It's up to you.

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "E"

This argument is sponsored by:
San Francisco Fire and Police Campaign Committee
Proposition "E" is endorsed by:
George W. Johns, Secretary, San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Fire Commission; Dr. Robert Grosso, President
William F. Murray, Chief, Fire Department
San Francisco Police Officers' Association

On September 12, 1906, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1906, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "E"

Vote "No" on "E"—Turn Down This Attempt to Give the Supervisors Power to Provide More Fringe Benefits.

If Prop. "E" is approved you may see the supervisors setting fringe benefits for 3,500 police and firemen by those paid in Torrance or Anaheim. Vote "No" on "E" because it is not fairly presented to you. You, the voter, should retain the right to decide costly fringe benefits such as night differentials, overtime and longevity (long service) pay. By giving the supervisors this power the costs could skyrocket.

Vote "No" on "E" because San Francisco already has the highest police and fire salary schedules among large cities in the state.

Vote "No" on "E"—Don't Give Away Your Rights as a Voter.

This argument is sponsored by The San Francisco Municipal Conference.

LLOYD E. GRAYBIEL, Chairman

The San Francisco Municipal Conference is composed of the following organizations:
Apartment House Associations
Consolidated, Inc.
Building Owners and Managers Assn.
California Northern Hotel Assn.
Down Town Association
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Real Estate Board

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

Amends Sections 35.5.1 and 36.2: Permits Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide longevity pay for policemen and firemen and overtime, night or specialized service pay to all ranks. Limits maximum amount that may be provided.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it is my opinion that it would not, of itself, create any additional costs but as a product of its future application, additional costs may be created that are not determinable at this time.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
PROPOSITION F

Amends Section 165.2: Prescribes survivor benefits upon death of member of retirement system and restricts benefits paid to member convicted of crime involving moral turpitude.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said City and County by amending Section 165.2 relating to retirement and survivor benefits of miscellaneous employees.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1966, a proposal to amend the charter of said City and County by amending Section 165.2 to read as follows:

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

Retirement—Miscellaneous Officers and Employees on and after July 1, 1947

Section 165.2. Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under section 165 of the charter on the effective date hereof, hereby designated as the first day of July, 1947, and persons who become miscellaneous officers and employees after said effective date, shall be members of the retirement system on and after said date, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in sections 158 to 161, both inclusive, 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 165 of the charter on said effective date, however, shall have the option to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and to be filed at the office of said system not later than ninety days after the effective date hereof, of being members of the system under section 165 instead of this section, the election under said option to be effective on said effective date, provided, that members who are absent by reason of service in the armed forces of the United States or by reason of any other service included in section 161 of the charter, on the effective date of the amendment, shall have the same option of electing to be members under section 165 instead of this section, until ninety days after their return to service. On and after said date, the persons who affirmatively exercise said option, shall continue to be members of the system under section 165 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section.

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

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

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the workmen's compensation laws of the State of California shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section, excluding that part of such remuneration which exceeds $500.00 per month, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the retirement board, which would have been earned by the member had he worked, throughout the period under consideration, 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, excluding that part of such remuneration which exceeds $500.00 per month, 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 165 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 158 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 159 of the charter.

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

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

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

(B) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty-five years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection (G) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of seventy years during the twelve months ending June 30, 1948; the age of sixty-nine years during the twelve months ending June 30, 1949; the age of sixty-eight years during the twelve months ending June 30, 1950; the age of sixty-seven years during the twelve months ending
June 30, 1951; the age of sixty-six years during the twelve months ending June 30, 1952; and thereafter, 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 1&frac13; per cent of said average final compensation, for each year of service. 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-five years, computed under subsection (G), shall be such as can be provided at the age of retirement by the actuarial value, at the age of retirement, of the retirement allowance to which he would be entitled upon retirement at age sixty and with the service credited at the date of actual retirement. Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection (C) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits. The portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $50 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 with 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 $50.00 per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

(C) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in subsection (G) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and one-half per cent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in subsection (A) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds one-third (1/3) of his average final compensation; otherwise one and one-half (1½) per cent 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 one-third (1/3) of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner pre-
scribed, for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earned by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the five (5) years immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

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

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

1. If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection (E), a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earned by him during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his contributions and interest credited thereon.

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

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

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

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

(F) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and re-employment with and without re-deposits 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, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of service and age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1.25 per cent 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 his estate or designated beneficiary.

(G) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

(1) Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during 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 by 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 161 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 165.

(H) All payments provided under this section shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) The rate of contribution of each member under this section shall be based on his nearest age at the effective date of his membership in the retirement system. The normal rate of contribution of each such member, to be effective from the effective date of membership under this section, shall be such as, on the average for such member, will provide, assuming service without interruption, under subsection (B) of this section, one-half of that portion of the service retirement allowance to which he would be entitled if retired at age sixty or higher age after rendering ten years of service for retirement under that subsection. No adjustment shall be included in said rates because of time during which members have contributed at different rates. Members' rates of contributions shall be changed only in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for changing contribution rates of other members.

(2) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under this section, a sum determined by applying the member's rate of contribution to such compensation. Amounts which would have been deducted in the absence of the limit on such deductions according to service credited, shall be paid to the retirement system following the removal of such limit, in manners and at times approved by the retirement board. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member, under this section or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in subsections (E) and (F) of this section, provided that the portion of the salaries of the teachers as provided in section 165, paragraph (a), as a basis for fixing the contributions to be made, and the benefits to be received, by the teachers under the retirement system shall be determined by the method provided in section 165, paragraph (a) and shall not be less than eighty per cent of the total salary received by the teachers, excluding that part of such portion which exceeds $500.00 per month, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

(8) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of
subsection (G), and deducted prior to the effective date hereof, 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.

(4) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on the effective date hereof, 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.

(5) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection (H), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (I), subsection (H), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system as provided by the board of supervisors, 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 systems 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.

(6) 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 said effective date, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

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

Should any such retired person engage in gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of sixty years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him in such occupation, shall not exceed his compensation at the time of his retirement.

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

(L) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (B), (C), (F) or (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 right to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that, if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection (B) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

Ordered Submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O’Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “F”

Vote “Yes” on Proposition “F”

San Francisco’s Retirement System contains two serious inequities which will be erased by this proposed amendment.

First, the question of providing a retirement allowance to a member who is 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.

Second, the failure of the System to provide benefits to surviving spouses or children of members who become eligible for retirement by reason of age and service but who die while still in City Service.

With reference to the first inequity, the integrity of San Francisco’s Retirement System has been seriously challenged by widespread charges
that officers or employees convicted of crimes in connection with their official duties and who are summarily dismissed from the service, still retain their full retirement benefits.

Under this proposed amendment it will no longer be possible for persons convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, in connection with their official duties, to benefit from the City's portion of contributions to the Retirement System.

Thus, the integrity of the System is preserved under this proposed amendment, taxpayers' contributions are protected, and full confidence in our Retirement System is restored to all of San Francisco's dedicated civil servants.

With reference to the second inequity, this proposed amendment erases the so-called "death gamble" by providing that once a member of the Retirement System attains eligibility for retirement by reason of age and service, and dies while still in service, the member's surviving spouse, or children if under age 18, shall be entitled to one-half of the member's retirement allowance, in the same manner as if the employee had died after retirement.

Current charter provisions provide normal retirement at age 60 with 30 years' service. Compulsory retirement is at age 65. Many employees, however, continue to work between ages 60 and 65. Although having reached eligibility for retirement by reason of age and service, the surviving spouses or children forfeit survivorship benefits if the members die while still in City Service.

A recent Retirement Board survey shows that San Francisco is the only major public jurisdiction in California which does not provide this survivorship benefit to spouses or children if members attain eligibility for retirement but who die while still in service.

Thus, this proposed amendment erases two serious defects in the Retirement System. In short, the public, taxpayers, and City Employees will share equally in promoting a sound, reasonable and fair Retirement System.

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "F"

Endorsed by:
Civil Service Association of San Francisco
George W. Johns, Secretary, San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Labor Council

On September 12, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1966, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

PROPOSITION "F"

Amends Section 165.2: Prescribes survivor benefits upon death of member of retirement system and restricts benefits paid to member convicted of crime involving moral turpitude.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, based on an actuarial report submitted by the Employees' Retirement System, it is estimated that the annual increase in the cost of government would be approximately $97,897.00. Based on the 1966-1967 assessment roll, this estimated annual increase is equivalent to fifty-six hundredths (0.56) of one cent in the tax rate.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
PROPOSITION G

Amends Section 154: Provides that method of disciplinary proceedings and hearing shall be established by rule of Civil Service Commission, subject to amendment or approval by Board of Supervisors by ordinance.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 154 thereof, relating to disciplinary hearings of employees.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on November 8, 1966, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 154 thereof, so that the same shall read as follows:

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

Suspension and Dismissal for Cause

Section 154. No person employed under the civil service provisions of this charter who has completed a probationary period of appointment, exclusive of uniformed members of the police and fire departments as provided under section 155 hereof, ((in a position defined by the commission as "permanent")) shall be removed or discharged except for cause, upon written charges, and after an opportunity to be heard in his own defense. The civil service commission by rule, subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors, shall provide for the administration, regulation, and interpretation of the provisions of this section. Such rules, though not limited to the following, shall prescribe: (1) the method of notification to the employee; (2) the detailed charges; (3) the manner of conducting the hearing; (4) who shall conduct the hearing, including provision for the contractual employment and assignment of qualified hearing officers, who shall be members of the State Bar of California; provided that any designated hearing officers shall have had extensive experience in serving as impartial arbitrators in discharge, suspension or disciplinary cases in private industry in the city and county of San Francisco; (5) the penalties; (6) and the review of the decision by the civil service commission. Such rules shall also provide for procedures to govern suspensions of employees for disciplinary purposes including loss of salary, provided however that such suspensions shall not exceed 30 days.

This amendment shall become operative upon the effective date of the ordinance approving the rule of the civil service commission enacted in accordance with the provisions of this section. ((Pending such hearing, the appointing officer may suspend the person so accused; but such suspension shall not be valid for more than thirty days, unless hearing upon the charges shall be delayed beyond such time by the act of the accused person. When charges are made, the appointing officer shall, in writing, notify the person accused of the time and place when the charges will be heard, by mailing such statement to his last known address. The appointing officer shall publicly hear and determine the charges, and may exonerate, suspend
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or dismiss the accused. If the employee is exonerated, the appointing officer may, at his discretion, remit the suspension and may order payment of salary to the employee for the time under suspension, and the report of such suspension shall thereupon be expunged from the record of service of such employee. The civil service commission shall immediately be notified of the charges when made, of the hearing, and of the finding thereon. The finding of the appointing officer shall be final, unless within thirty days therefrom the dismissed employee appeals to the civil service commission. The appeal and all proceedings shall be in writing and shall briefly state the grounds therefor. The civil service commission shall examine into the case and may require the appointing officer to furnish a record of the hearing and may require in writing any additional evidence it deems material, and may, thereupon, make such decision as it deems just. The order or decision of the commission upon such appeal shall be final and shall forthwith be enforced by the appointing officer. If the civil service commission shall reverse or alter the finding of the appointing officer it may, in its discretion, order that the employee affected be paid salary from the time of his discharge or suspension.

The civil service commission may hear and determine any charge filed by a citizen or by the authorized agents of the commission when the appointing officer neglects or refuses to act. Removal or discharge may be made for any of the following causes: incompetence, habitual intemperance, immoral conduct, insubordination, discourteous treatment of the public, dishonesty, inattention to duties, or engaging in prohibited political activities.

Nothing in this section shall limit or restrict rules adopted by the commission governing lay-offs or reduction in force.

The appointing officer may, for disciplinary purposes, suspend a subordinate for a period not exceeding thirty days; and suspension shall carry with it the loss of salary for the period of suspension. The suspended employee shall be notified in writing of the reason for such suspension, and if the suspension be for more than five days the employee shall, at his request, be given a hearing by the appointing officer. The decision of the appointing officer in all cases of suspension for disciplinary purposes shall be final.)

Ordered Submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “G”

Vote “Yes” on Proposition “G”

Modern, efficient and fair disciplinary procedures are totally lacking in City Service. Under current charter provisions, appointing officers are forced to assume the role of accuser, prosecutor, judge and jury. The result: Unfair, unsatisfactory and inefficient procedures and penalties.

The purpose of this proposed amendment is:
1. To make possible the establishment of uniform disciplinary procedures and penalties in City Service, and

2. To provide an impartial, highly qualified and trained hearing officer to hear and conduct disciplinary cases.

To accomplish these two desirable personnel practices, the Civil Service Commission, under this proposal, will prepare rules governing the procedures for effecting disciplinary actions, and for the employment and use of a hearing officer to hear and determine charges made by appointing officers.

The Board of Supervisors, as the elected representatives of the voters of San Francisco, will have authority to approve, amend, or reject the rules of the Civil Service Commission.

The taxpayers of San Francisco, the public-at-large, and City Employees themselves will benefit from this proposed amendment. Uniformity of disciplinary procedures and penalties stops inefficiency and stops the waste of valuable man-hours. Employing a hearing officer releases appointing officers from a repugnant, time-consuming process, at a significant savings to the taxpayers.

The proposed amendment modernizes an archaic system. It installs a practice which is widespread throughout private industry and other governmental agencies. It destroys a current system which creates ill-will, distrust, and poor employee morale in the area of disciplinary proceedings and penalties.

Management and employees, top City officials, including the City's elected officials, support this proposed amendment. It is the key to the solution of a problem which degrades City Service.

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "G"

Proposition "G" has been endorsed by:

Civil Service Association of San Francisco
San Francisco City & County Employees Union Local 400
George W. Johns, Secretary, San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Labor Council

On September 12, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1966, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION "G"

Amends Section 154: Provides that method of disciplinary proceedings and hearing shall be established by rule of Civil Service Commission, subject to amendment or approval by Board of Supervisors by ordinance.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it is my opinion that it would not, of itself, create any additional costs but as a product of its future application, additional costs may be created that are not determinable at this time.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
PROPOSITION H

Amends Section 148: Makes technical change permitting Civil Service Commission to return name of terminated probationary employee to eligible list under conditions deemed by Commission to be just.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said City and County by amending Section 148 relating to requisition, certification and appointment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1966, a proposal to amend the charter of said City and County by amending Section 148 thereof to read as follows:

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

Requisition, Certification and Appointment

Section 148. Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this charter is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer, the name and address of the person standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is promotive, the commission shall certify the name of the person standing highest on such list. In making such certification, sex shall be disregarded except when a statute, a rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies sex.

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

Any appointment to a position declared permanent by the civil service commission shall be on probation for a period of six months, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniform rank of the police department shall be for one year. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employees and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of uniformed members of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall inquire into the circumstances. 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 ((for certification to another department)) 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
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(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 the position from which he was promoted. 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.

Ordered Submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “H”

Vote “Yes” on Proposition “H”

The purpose of this proposed amendment is to correct a technical defect in the Charter.

This proposed amendment will permit the Civil Service Commission to return the name of a probationary employee to the eligible list for reappointment to the same department when the appointment of the probationary employee is terminated because of reasons such as illness, accident, leave of absence, or similar reasons.

Under existing Charter provisions, an employee terminated during his probationary period cannot be returned to the same department. In City service there are a number of positions established for service in only one department; for example, bus operators, hospital workers, street cleaners, school janitors, etc.

This proposed amendment has the strong endorsement of the Civil Service Commission as a means to correct a serious defect in the Charter, and as a means to effectively reduce the high cost of employee turnover and training.

Taxpayers and the public alike will benefit from this proposed amendment. The City’s personnel program and employment procedures will be improved immeasurably by passage of this Charter amendment.

Vote “Yes” on Proposition “H”

Proposition “H” is endorsed by:

Civil Service Association of San Francisco
George W. Johns, Secretary, San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Labor Council

On September 12, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1966, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
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PROPOSITION I

Amends Section 153: Provides that employees' leaves of absence be governed by rules of Civil Service Commission. Requires approval of rule by Board of Supervisors. Permits Board to approve, amend, or reject rule.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 153 thereof relating to leaves of absence for officers and employees of the City and County.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1966, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 153 thereof, to read as follows:

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

Leaves of Absence

Section 153. Leaves of absence to officers and employees of the city and county shall be governed by rules established by the civil service commission. ((provided that leave of absence to any officer or employee for the purpose of leaving the city and county, taking a position outside of the city and county service, or accepting a position in some department or office of the city and county other than the one in which he is employed and where the duties are in no way related to the duties covered by his civil service classification, shall be limited to six (6) months; and provided, further, that no limit shall be placed on a leave of absence granted to enable an officer or employee to accept promotion to a non-civil service position in the same department in which he holds civil service status, or promotion to co-related work in another department or office of the city and county.))

Leaves of absence shall be granted to officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco and non-certificated officers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District for service in the armed forces of the United States or the State of California or for service on ships operated by or for the United States government in time of war and for such time thereafter as may be provided by rule of the civil service commission, but not to exceed two (2) years after the proclamation of peace, except in case of disability incurred while in active service with the armed forces or the merchant marine when such disability shall extend beyond such period.

Whenever any officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, or any non-certificated officer or employee of the San Francisco Unified School District shall, by order of the government of the United States or by lawful order of any of its departments or officers, or by lawful order of the State of California, or any of its departments or officers, be directed in time of peace to report and serve in the armed forces of the United States, or in the armed forces of the State of California, said officer
or employee shall be entitled to a leave of absence from his office or position during the time of such service and for a period not to exceed three (3) months after the expiration thereof. Officers and employees entering or being inducted into any of the services requiring military leave as provided in this section shall file with the civil service commission a copy of the orders necessitating such service prior to the effective date of the leave of absence. Leaves granted pursuant to the provisions of this and the preceding paragraph of this section shall be designated “military leaves.”

The board of supervisors may, on the recommendation of the civil service commission, provide by ordinance that leaves of absence shall be granted to officers and employees during time of war or during any emergency declared by the President of the United States, for other service directly connected with the prosecution of the war or national defense or preparedness. Leaves granted under authority of ordinances enacted pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph shall be designated “war effort leaves.”

In time of emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress, or while any act authorizing compulsory military service or training is in effect, the board of supervisors, upon recommendation of the civil service commission, may provide by ordinance that subject to rules of the civil service commission, leaves of absence shall be granted to officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco and non-certificated officers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District, for sea duty as licensed officers aboard ships operated by or for the United States government.

Any officer or employee on military leave, who, prior to such leave, has been appointed to a permanent position in the city and county service, shall be entitled to resume such position at the expiration of his leave, and in determining and fixing rights, seniority, salary and otherwise, which have accrued and shall inure to the benefit of such officer or employee, the term of military leave shall be considered and accounted a part of his service under the city and county.

Persons serving in the armed forces of the United States or the State of California during time of war or during any emergency lawfully declared by the President of the United States, who have standing on an eligible list, shall retain their places thereon, and upon presenting an honorable discharge or certificate of honorable active service from such military service within the period of time and subject to the conditions as prescribed by rules of the civil service commission, shall be preferred for appointment for a period of four (4) years after the proclamation of peace or the termination of said emergency in the order of standing upon such register at the time of entering such military service and before candidates procuring standing through an examination held subsequent to the entrance of such eligibles into the military service. If while in said military service the names of such persons are reached for certification to permanent positions, appointments shall be made to serve until such persons in the military service shall present to the civil service commission an honorable discharge or certificate of honorable active service within the period of time and subject to the conditions as prescribed by rules of the civil service commission, but not more than one (1) year after the date of discharge of each such eligible, when they shall be certified and assume the duties of positions in said class and their certification to said positions for all purposes of seniority shall be deemed to be the date when their names on such eligible lists were reached for certification, provided that each appointee to a position
shall serve such probationary period as is required in section 148 of this charter, and provided that such employee while serving on such probation shall be permitted to participate in any promotive examination to which his classification is eligible but shall not be entitled to certification by virtue of such promotional examination prior to satisfactory completion of said probationary period and provided further that no such persons shall be certified to entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments under this provision who are more than thirty-five (35) years of age unless the names of such persons were reached for certification to such positions before such persons reached said age.

Persons who participate in a regular written civil service examination and who by reason of their active services in the Army, Navy or Marine Corps are unable to complete all parts of the examination and who present their orders or other competent proof of service in the same manner as is required of eligibles, shall acquire standing on eligible lists in accordance with the relative excellence attained by participation in the part or parts of the examinations already completed; provided that upon presenting their honorable discharges or certificates of honorable active service within the time limits specified in this section covering eligibles, they must qualify in the remainder of the examinations. When qualified they shall be certified as of the date they would have been reached for certification in accordance with the relative excellence attained by their participation in the entire examination.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of leaves as herein provided and to govern lay-offs occasioned by the return of officers, employees, or eligibles who have been appointed and granted leave or certified as provided in this section.

All leaves of absence granted under Rule 31.2 of the civil service commission are hereby ratified and approved.

For the purpose of certifications, appointments, leaves or any other matters concerning the rights of persons who are serving or have served in the armed forces of the United States or the State of California, the provisions of this section shall be retroactive to September 16, 1940, and any persons heretofore granted military leaves for any purpose other than to enter the armed forces of the United States or the State of California shall be deemed to have been granted war effort leaves by the civil service commission in accordance with the provisions of this section.

The civil service commission by rule (and subject to the approval of the board of supervisors by ordinance,) shall provide for leaves of absence, due to illness or disability, which leave or leaves may be cumulative, if not used as authorized, provided that the accumulated unused period of sick leave shall not exceed six (6) months, regardless of length of service, and provided further that violation or abuse of the provisions of said rule and ordinance by any officer or employee shall be deemed an act of insubordination and inattention to duties.

The board of supervisors shall approve, amend or reject all amendments to the rules governing leaves of absence as proposed by the civil service commission; provided, that before making any amendment thereto the board of supervisors shall request the civil service commission to review and report on said proposed amendment.

Ordered Submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.
I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "I"

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "I"

The purpose of this proposed amendment is to modernize and improve existing leave provisions for City employment.

Under existing Charter provisions, employees are restricted to 6 months’ leave of absence without pay for the purpose of taking a position outside City and County service. This restriction deprives employees the opportunity to take leaves of absence without pay to acquire further education including advanced university degrees or to participate in specialized training programs which exceed 6 months in length.

In addition, existing Charter provisions prohibit employees taking leaves of absence without pay to participate in such programs as the Peace Corps, VISTA, Job Corps, civilian service in such locations as Vietnam and other foreign countries, etc. Participation in such programs usually requires a minimum of 2 years’ service.

This proposed amendment allows the Civil Service Commission to prepare rules governing such leaves of absence, including sick leave with pay privileges, subject to approval and amendment of the Board of Supervisors.

It is a fair, reasonable proposal, one which allows flexibility in the administration of leave without pay procedures and sick leave with pay, as conditions warrant from time to time. There is no cost to the taxpayers involved in this proposed Charter amendment.

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "I"

Proposition "I" is endorsed by:

Civil Service Association of San Francisco
San Francisco City & County Employees Union, Local 400
George W. Johns, Secretary, San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Labor Council

On September 12, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1966, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

PROPOSITION "I"

Amends Section 153: Provides that employees’ leaves of absence be governed by rules of Civil Service Commission. Requires approval of rule by Board of Supervisors. Permits Board to approve, amend, or reject rule.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it is my opinion that it would not, of itself, create any additional costs but as a product of its future application, additional costs may be created that are not determinable at this time.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
PROPOSITION J

Amends Section 34: Removes requirements that attorneys be qualified to practice in all courts of state for at least two years prior to appointment in offices of City Attorney, District Attorney and Public Defender.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 34 thereof, relating to assistants and employees in elective offices.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1966, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 34 thereof, so that the same shall read as follows:

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

Assistants and Employees in Elective Offices

Section 34. The elective officers of the city and county may appoint such assistants and employees as are authorized by the supervisors upon the recommendation of the mayor, in the annual budget and annual or supplemental appropriation ordinances, and may discipline and remove the same, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter except as otherwise specifically exempted by the provisions of this charter. Each assistant attorney in the offices of the city attorney, the district attorney and the public defender must, at the time of his appointment, be qualified to practice in all of the courts of the state *(and must have been so qualified for at least two years next preceding his appointment)*. The salaries, wages and compensation of every kind and nature, except pensions and retirement allowances, for assistants and employees in such elective offices, shall be fixed as provided by the salary standardization provisions of this charter.

Ordered Submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
PROPOSITION K

Adds Section 36.10: Establishes arbitration board for settling disputes relating to discipline, work schedules, or working conditions between Fire Commission and arbitration and grievance committee of firemen. Makes finding of Board binding on both parties.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by adding Section 36.10 thereto, establishing a procedure for arbitration of disputes between the Fire Commission and the Arbitration and Grievance Committee of Employees.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1966, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by adding Section 36.10 thereto, so that the same shall read as follows:

Arbitration

Section 36.10. In the event of a dispute or grievance over discipline, work schedules or working conditions within the power of the fire commission to grant or establish, which is not resolved by discussions in good faith between the fire commission and the arbitration and grievance committee of the employees, hereinafter referred to as the parties, either party may submit the dispute to an arbitration board composed of a member of the fire commission, a representative designated by the arbitration and grievance committee of the employees and a third member to be appointed by the mayor after consultation with both parties. If the parties cannot agree on the third member, the mayor shall request the conciliation service of the department of industrial relations of the State of California to submit the names of five (5) arbitrators. Each of the parties shall eliminate two (2) names from the list to determine the person who is to serve. Upon submission of the dispute to the arbitration board, the board shall hold a hearing or hearings concerning the dispute and the findings of the majority of the members of the board in such arbitration shall be binding on both parties. The expenses of the third member shall be borne equally by the parties. Each party shall bear the expense of its own presentation. Procedures for designation of the membership of the arbitration and grievance committee of the employees shall be set forth in an ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Ordered Submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, von Beroldingen.

Noes: Supervisors Blake, Casey, Tamaras.

I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
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ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "K"

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "K"

Firemen without the right to strike are entitled to "alternative" procedures for settling disputes over discipline, work schedules, and other working conditions. It is unfair not to establish procedures such as fact-finding, mediation, or arbitration when the employees have severely limited means of settling grievances.

San Francisco firemen, who have voluntarily relinquished their right to strike, (by being a member of the International Association of Fire Fighters—which organization has a "No Strike" clause in its Constitution and By-laws) should have participation in the administration of the employment relationship to at least as full an extent as has been developed under private collective bargaining, including full provision for independent arbitration of unresolved differences.

Proposition "K" is endorsed by:
San Francisco Fire Fighters, Local 798
On September 12, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1966. by the following vote:
Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "K"

Vote "No" on "K"—It Is a Harmful and Unnecessary Proposal.

Prop. "K" would permit employees and unions to appeal to an arbitration board any decisions by the fire commission on discipline, work schedules or working conditions. The arbitration decision would be binding. These matters are perhaps the major function of the commission.

Vote "No" on "K." It Would Greatly Weaken the Fire Commission.

This argument is sponsored by The San Francisco Municipal Conference.

LLOYD E. GRAYBIEL, Chairman

The San Francisco Municipal Conference is composed of the following organizations:
Apartment House Associations Consolidated, Inc.
Building Owners and Managers Assn.
California Northern Hotel Assn.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

PROPOSITION "K"

Adds Section 36.10: Establishes arbitration board for settling disputes relating to discipline, work schedules or working conditions between fire commission and arbitration and grievance committee of firemen. Makes finding of board binding on both parties.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it is my opinion that it would not, of itself, create any additional costs but as a product of its future application, additional costs may be created that are not determinable at this time.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
PROPOSITION L

Amends Section 35: Increases membership of Police Commission from three to five members.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 35 thereof, relating to an increase of membership of the Police Commission.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1966, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 35 thereof, so that that the same shall read as follows:

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

Police Department

Section 35. The Police Department shall consist of a Police Commission, Chief of Police, a police force and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter, and shall be under the management of a Police Commission consisting of ((three)) five members, who shall be appointed by the Mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred dollars ($1200). The term of each commissioner shall be four years. ((commencing at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years, 1945, 1946 and 1948, respectively.)) The incumbents serving as members of the Commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the Commission, shall continue to hold their respective positions, subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this amendment shall become effective, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. They shall have power to regulate traffic by means of police officers and the emergency use of temporary signs or devices.

The traffic bureau is hereby established under the jurisdiction of the chief of police. The bureau shall be in charge of a traffic director, who shall have powers and duties relating to street traffic, subject to laws relating thereto and to the police commission, as follows: (a) to regulate all street traffic by means of police officers and the emergency use of temporary signs or devices; (b) to promote traffic safety education and to receive and give prompt attention to complaints in relation to street traffic and to refer all complaints relating to or arising from street design or from traffic devices, or the absence thereof, to the department of public works; (c) to collect and compile traffic accident data, copies thereof shall be furnished to the department of public works; (d) to cooperate and advise for the best performance of these functions, with the department of public works, the public utilities commission, the fire department, the department of city planning, the board of supervisors and other departments and agencies of the city and county and state as may be necessary; and (e) to
review all proposed plans relating to street traffic control devices which are received from the department of public works and to make such recommendations to that department as may be deemed necessary for the proper regulation of street traffic within fifteen (15) days after receipt of said plans from the department of public works, pursuant to Section 107.1 of this charter.

The powers and duties of the traffic director hereinabove stated shall not modify to any extent the powers and duties of any department or office, but shall be, first for the purpose of assisting the police commission in its regulation of traffic, and, second, for the purpose of recommendation only, to other departments or offices upon matters within their jurisdiction, but affecting to any extent the regulation of traffic.

Ordered Submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

Noes: Supervisors Blake, O'Shea.

I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “L”

This proposed Charter amendment is a meaningful and progressive redrafting of outmoded City Charter provisions. It will expand the membership of the commission to five members instead of three, with all the advantages and benefits to the people at large which go along with broader cross-representation of the various segments of our community.

This amendment will bring the Charter up-to-date. It adds consistency to our method of appointing commissioners who serve as policy-makers for their particular functions. It eliminates a work-stopping short-handedness which confronts the commission recurrently. All other City commissions (i.e., except the Police, Fire and Civil Service Commissions which are at this time the subject of proposed Charter amendments to increase their memberships to five) have at least five members to share discharge of their increasingly demanding duties.

This Charter amendment will produce direct and substantial benefits for the public. It will enhance the proper administration of the department. It will relieve the burdens on the commission in the following ways, among others:

The present three-member commission was created long before 1932 when the present Charter became effective. In our new era today, the greatly increased scope of municipal services, the expanded local services which our citizens expect and need, and the almost bewildering complexity of urban affairs, demand that an adequately-manned commission be available to accommodate the day-to-day business which must be transacted. The Federal Government has recognized the need for specialized intensive treatment of these complex matters by creating a Department of Urban Affairs.

A five-member commission will permit a larger, but still not unwieldy, number of members to delve into departmental problems and fix administrative policies.

A five-member commission will enable commission responsibilities to be distributed to a greater extent among the members, who can thus devote a greater amount of time to assigned duties. This will be of particular value
to the City in the handling of personnel problems which in growing numbers clutter commission calendars.

A five-member commission will enable the members to assume more intensive investigatory functions, and they can personally develop facts for considered action in the best interests of their department rather than rely completely on the reports of administrators who may not be wholly objective toward the employees involved or toward the public.

A five-member commission will not change the appointing power of the Mayor in any way, but it will enable him to take advantage of the opportunity to appoint more members representative of more areas and interests in the community. This will mean that where today a particular commission is deprived of representation from labor, or from the woman's viewpoint, or from racial, ethnic and religious groups, the additional members may give the City the benefit of their fresh ideas in keeping with the demands of the times.

A five-member commission will provide greater assurance that the commission will be available at all times to discharge their duties. Today, if more than one member is ill or absent from the City, the commission is out of business because a quorum is not present to act. Two immediate instances occurred when the Civil Service Commission was not able to take a definitive position on (1) the nurses' demand for increased compensation and (2) the desirability of the Charter amendment to change the number of its members, because one of the three members was ill and the remaining members could not agree. With a five-member commission, two members may be unavailable and yet the commission will continue to function without impairment, at the instant needed.

A five-member commission will up-date our democratic representative concepts of local government. In 1940, San Francisco's population was 634,536. About one out of twenty was Spanish-speaking or non-white. Today, San Francisco has a population of approximately 750,000. About one out of three is Spanish-speaking or non-white. While this change does not require the appointment of minority representatives, but rather preserves the Mayor's prerogatives of making appointments as he deems fit, it obviously expands the field of appointment and makes room for whatever type of representation might best meet the requirements of the commission.

The figures attest unequivocally to the need for more opportunities to bring to our commissions the insight, knowledge and understanding which is essential to adequate consideration and solution of the problems of these large minorities, to the best advantage of all the people of San Francisco.

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, based on the present annual compensations, it is estimated that the increase in the cost of government would be $2,400 annually.

Based on the 1966-1967 assessment roll, $2,400 is equivalent to fourteen one thousandths of one cent (0.014) in the tax rate.

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "L"—and give all the people of San Francisco the benefit of broader representation on City commissions.

Proposition "L" is endorsed by:
Bayview Community Center; John Burton, Assemblyman, 20th District; William K. Cohenitz; Arthur H. Coleman, M.D.; Jay A. Darwin; The Democratic Forum; Rabbi Alvin I. Fine; Jewish Labor Committee; George W. Johns, Secretary, San Francisco Labor Council; Mexican American Political Association; Mary E. Salazar; San Francisco Labor Council; Percy H. Steele, Jr.; Phillip Burton, Member of Congress; Melvin Bell; Zuretti L. Goosby, D.D.S.; Mrs. Robert Lauter; Willie L. Brown, Jr., Assemblyman; Merced Heights Neighborhood Assn., Alfred S. Dale Jr., Pres.; San Francisco Branch National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, by Clifton R. Jeffers; Jackson K. Hu; San Francisco City & County Employees Union, Local 400,
J. E. Jeffery, Exec. Secy.; Donald B. King; Susan J. Bierman; Gerald N. Hill; Rev. A. Cecil Williams; S.F. Greater Chinatown Community Service Assn, J. K. Choy, President; John F. Delury; Daniel A. Collins, D.D.S.; Edward P. Eichler; San Francisco Conference on Religion and Race, Rita R. Samel, Coordinator; Joseph G. Kennedy Judge of Municipal Court; Jack H. Werchick; John A. O’Connell; Yan Wu Benevolent Association; San Francisco Joint ILWU Legislative Committee; Orville Luster; Benjamin Dreufus; Nathan Cohn; Mrs. Charlotte C. Poole; Chinese American Democratic Club, Inc.

On September 12, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1966, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “L”

Vote No on “L”

Just last November the San Francisco voters overwhelmingly defeated the same proposition now offered as Proposition “L.” In fact, more people voted against the commission-packing scheme than against any other item on that ballot. But certain interests have had the arrogance to again force a vote on the same matter. So let’s vote NO on “L” again.

Vote No on “L”

The Charter calls for three members on the Police Commission because this is the most efficient number to deal swiftly and justly with police problems. Five members makes fast action difficult. Adding more members could be serious. The Police Commission is frequently involved in major emergencies requiring speedy action for the protection of all parts of the public.

Some commissions have more members because they have more leisure to deal with their problems—like the Social Services Commission, the Board of Education, the Housing Authority, the Board of Permit Appeals. Incidentally, there’s a Negro on each of these, but not for political reasons—it’s because he or she deserved the job.

Vote No on “L”

Let’s not play politics with public safety. Let’s not insult minority groups with this kind of patronage. Vote NO on “L.”

Members on this commission, past and present, agree they’re not overworked. They have proven they can handle their problems on a three-man basis. They don’t need another two executives to clutter up the meetings and add to taxpayers’ expense.

Proposition “L” downgrades our minority groups by implying that they need special preference. Vote NO on “L”.

Vote NO on Proposition “L”, the commission-packing scheme.

This statement is sponsored by the CITIZENS AGAINST PROPOSITION “L”: Don Fazackerley, Chairman. A partial list of members, all of whom are former members of the Police Commission, includes: Paul A. Bissinger, Washington I. Kohnke, H. C. Maginn, Harold R. McKinnon, Jerd Sullivan, Edward L. Turkington, Ward G. Walkup, Sr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “L”

Vote “No” on “L”—The Commission-Packing Scheme Defeated Last Year. Props. “L”, “M” and “N” Would Increase the Police, Fire and Civil Service Commission From 3 to 5 Members.

Vote “No”—This is the same proposal you decisively voted down last year.

Vote “No”—The three-man commission has worked well for many years.
You don't need more commissioners, particularly more political appointees.

Vote "No" on "L", "M" and "N".

This argument is sponsored by The San Francisco Municipal Conference.

LLOYD E. GRAYBIEL, Chairman

The San Francisco Municipal Conference is composed of the following organizations:

- Apartment House Associations
- Consolidated, Inc.
- Building Owners and Managers Assn.
- California Northern Hotel Assn.
- Down Town Association
- San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
- San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce
- San Francisco Real Estate Board

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

PROPOSITION "L"

Amends Section 35: Increases membership of police commission from three to five members.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, based on the present annual compensation, it is estimated that the increase in the cost of government would be $2,400.00 annually.

Based on the 1966-67 assessment roll, $2,400.00 is equivalent to fourteen one thousandths (0.014) of one cent in the tax rate.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION M

Amends Section 36: Increases membership of Fire Commission from three to five members.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 36 thereof, relating to an increase of membership of the Fire Commission.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1966, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 36 thereof, so that the same shall read as follows:

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

Fire Department

Section 36. The Fire Department shall be under the management of a Fire Commission, consisting of ((three)) five members, who shall be appointed by the Mayor; and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred ($1200). The term of each Commissioner shall be four years. ((commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years of 1948, 1949, and 1950 respectively.)) The incumbents serving as members of the Commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective offices subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed.

The fire commission shall appoint a chief of department, a secretary and a department physician who shall hold office at its pleasure.
The fire commissioners shall be successors in office of the fire commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this charter shall go into effect, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. The commissioners shall have power, upon recommendation of the chief of department, to send fire boats, apparatus and men outside the City and County of San Francisco for firefighting purposes.

Positions of officers and employees of the fire department legally authorized shall continue, and the incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall continue as the officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments, and except as in this charter otherwise provided.

The several ranks in the fire department shall be: chief of department; deputy chief of department; chief, division of fire prevention and investigation; first assistant and second assistant chiefs of department; secretary to chief of department; battalion chiefs; supervisor of assignments, captains; lieutenants, inspector of fire department apparatus; engineers; chief's operators; drivers; tillermen; truckmen; hosemen; pilots of fire boats and marine engineers of fire boats; and the ranks specified in section 38.01 and 38.1 of this charter. The compensation for these ranks shall be determined as provided in section 36.2 of this charter.

The chief of department shall recommend and the fire commission shall provide by rule for work schedules or tours of duty for the officers and members occupying the several ranks of the fire department, provided however that all tours of duty established for officers and members assigned to the fire fighting companies, including the salvage corps, shall start at eight o'clock A.M. No such officer or member shall be required to work more than one hundred and twenty (120) hours in any fifteen-day period, nor shall any officer or member be required to work more than twenty-four consecutive hours except in case of a conflagration requiring the services of more than one-half of the force of the department. Officers and members may exchange watches with permission of the chief of department and time worked on such exchange of watches shall not be construed as time in violation of the limitation of 120 hours in any fifteen-day period nor twenty-four consecutive hours. Each such officer and each such member shall be entitled to at least one (1) day off duty during each week.

When, in the judgment of the fire commission, it is in the public interest that any such officer or member shall work on his day off and said officer or member consents to so work, he may at the direction of the chief of department work on said day off, and in addition to the regular compensation provided for said officer or member as set forth in this charter, said officer or member shall be entitled to be compensated at his regular rate of pay as provided for herein for said extra time served, or he shall be allowed the equivalent time off.

In any computation in the administration of the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System in which the compensation, as defined in any provisions relating to the retirement system, is a factor, compensation for overtime provided for in this section shall be excluded, and no such overtime compensation shall be deemed as compensation for any purpose relating to such retirement provisions.

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.
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Officers and members of the uniformed force shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedule of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors, pursuant to the provisions of section 151 of the charter, as additional days off with pay. Officers or members required to perform service in said departments on said days shall be compensated on the basis of straight time as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay in the judgment of the fire commission.

For payroll purposes, that portion of each tour of duty which falls within each calendar day shall constitute a single tour of duty. The rate of compensation for the service performed by officers or members on a holiday or for service performed on an assigned day off, as in this charter provided, shall be calculated by dividing the annual rates of pay for each fiscal year by the number of single tours of duty as scheduled for the several ranks in the fire fighting companies in said fiscal year.

The chief of department or, in his absence, the deputy chief or any assistant chief of department or, in their absence any battalion chief in charge, may, during a conflagration, cause to be cut down or otherwise removed any buildings or structures for the purpose of checking the progress of such conflagration.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence as defined by section 153 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 in this charter.

Ordered Submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Bosa, Casey, Ertola, Francols, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

Noes: Supervisors Blake, O’Shea.

I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “M”

Similar proposals for increasing the number of commission members from three to five appear in this ballot pamphlet as Propositions “L,” “M,” and “N,” relating respectively to the affirmative argument in support of the three Propositions, including this one (Proposition “M”), please refer to the argument in favor of Proposition “L,” on preceding pages of this pamphlet.

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, based on the present annual compensations, it is estimated that the increase in the cost of government would be $2,400 annually.

Based on the 1966-1967 assessment roll, $2,400 is equivalent to fourteen one thousandths of one cent (0.014) in the tax rate.

Proposition “M” is endorsed by:

Philip Burton, Member of Congress; Melvin Belli; Zuretti L. Goosby, D.D.S.; Mrs. Robert Lauter; Alvin Fine; Willie L. Brown, Jr., Assemblyman; Merced Heights Neighborhood Assn.; Alfred S. Dale, Jr., Pres.; San Francisco Branch National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; by Clifton R. Jeffers; Jackson K. Hu; San Francisco City & County Employees Union, Local 400; J. K. Choy, President; John F. Delury; Daniel A. Collins, D.D.S.; Edward P. Eichler; San Francisco Conference on Religion and Race; Rita R. Semel, Coordinator; Joseph G. Kennedy, Judge of Municipal Court; Jack H. Werchick; John A. O'Connell; Yan Wo Benevolent Association; San Francisco Joint ILWU Legis-
Amends Section 36: Increases membership of fire commission from three to five members.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, based on the present annual compensation, it is estimated that the increase in the cost of government would be $2,400.00 annually.

Based on the 1966-67 assessment roll, $2,400.00 is equivalent to fourteen one thousandths (0.014) of one cent in the tax rate.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION N

Amends Section 140: Increases membership of Civil Service Commission from three to five members.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 140 thereof, relating to an increase of membership of the Civil Service Commission.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1966, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 140 thereof, so that the same shall read as follows:

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

Civil Service Commission

Section 140. There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county. All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations.

The Civil Service Commission shall consist of (three) five members appointed by the Mayor. The Commissioners in office at the time (of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended,) this amendment shall become effective shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional mem-
bers, whose offices are created by this amendment, shall expire on June 30, 1968, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such a time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission after the regular daily working hours of 8 A.M. to 5 P.M. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

Ordered Submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

Noes: Supervisors Blake, O'Shea.

I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "N"

Similar proposals for increasing the number of commission members from three to five appear in this ballot pamphlet as Propositions "L," "M," and "N," relating respectively to the Police, Fire, and Civil Service Commissions. For the complete text of the affirmative argument in support of the three Propositions, including this one (Proposition "N"), please refer to the argument in favor of Proposition "L," on preceding pages of this pamphlet.

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, based on the present annual compensations, it is estimated that the increase in the cost of government would be $2,400 annually.

Based on the 1966-1967 assessment roll, $2,400 is equivalent to fourteen one thousandths of one cent (0.014) in the tax rate.

Proposition "N" is endorsed by:

Phillip Burton, Member of Congress; Melvin Beili; Zuretti L. Goosby, D.D.S.; Mrs. Robert Lauter; Alvin Fine; Willie L. Brown, Jr., Assemblyman; Merced Heights Neighborhood Assn., Alfred S. Dale, Jr., Pres.; San Francisco Branch National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, by Clifton R. Jeffers; Jackson K. Hu; Donald B. King; Susan J. Bierman; Gerald N. Hill; Rev. A. Cecil Williams; S.F. Greater Chinatown Community Service Assn., J. K. Choy, President; John F. Delury; Daniel A. Collins, D.D.S.; Edward P. Eichler; San Francisco Conference on Religion and Race, Rita R. Semel, Coordinator; Joseph G. Kennedy, Judge of Municipal Court; Jack H. Werchick; John A. O'Connell; Van Wo Benevolent Association; San Francisco Joint LWU Legislative Committee; Orville Luster; Benjamin Dreyfus; Nathan Cohn; Mrs., Charlotte C. Poole; Chinese American Democratic Club, Inc.
On September 12, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1966, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Eftola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

PROPOSITION "N"

Amends Section 140: Increases membership of Civil Service Commission from three to five members.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, based on the present annual compensation, it is estimated that the increase in the cost of government would be $2,400.00 annually.

Based on the 1966-67 assessment roll, $2,400.00 is equivalent to fourteen one thousandths (0.014) of one cent in the tax rate.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION O

Amends Section 74: Repeals limitation of $.0075 per hundred dollars assessed valuation in deficit utility budget for capital cost expenditures and requirement that capital costs in excess thereof be financed through sale of bonds.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by repealing provisions of Section 74 thereof relating to limitation upon costs of capital improvements to public utilities in excess of estimate revenues therefrom financed through property taxes to three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) for each one hundred dollars ($100) of taxable property, and further repealing the requirement that capital costs in excess of such amount be financed by authorization and sale of bonds.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1966, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 74 thereof to read as follows:

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

Appropriations to Meet Utility Deficit

Section 74. In the event the public utilities commission and the mayor shall propose a budget for any utility which will exceed the estimated revenue of such utility, it shall require a vote of two-thirds of all members of the board of supervisors to approve such budget estimate and to appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the deficiency. *(Such budget of expenditures in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, in amount not to exceed three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each one hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that when-
ever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each one hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county and provided further that proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs in excess thereof shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 127 of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.)

Ordered Submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "O"

The purpose of this Charter amendment is to amend the capital expenditure procedure for a deficit utility.

San Francisco's transit system operates on a yearly budget of $30,000,000 out of which only $125,000 a year may be expended on capital improvements. Adoption of this proposition would mean that the system would no longer be tied to that unrealistic restriction which limits the amount that can be spent for motor coaches, streetcars, etc., to an inadequate $125,000 a year.

The proposed amendment would lift this restriction, but would still require the recommendation of the General Manager of Public Utilities, approval of the Public Utilities Commission, the Mayor, Finance Committee, two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors, and certification by the Controller before funds become available.

Proposition "O" is endorsed by:
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
George W. Johns, Secretary, San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Labor Council

On September 12, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1966, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183 PROPOSITION "O"

Amends Section 74: Repeals limitation of $.0075 per hundred dollars assessed valuation in deficit utility budget for capital cost expenditures and requirement that capital costs in excess thereof be financed through sale of bonds.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it is my opinion that it would not, of itself, create any additional costs but as a product of its future application, additional costs may be created that are not determinable at this time.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
PROPOSITION P

Adds Section 46.5: Creates, under ordinance of Board of Supervisors, Palace of Fine Arts Commission. Charges the Commission with the responsibility for the development, administration, management and operation of Palace of Fine Arts.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by adding Section 46.5 thereto creating a Palace of Fine Arts Commission.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1966, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by adding Section 46.5 thereto to read as follows:

Palace of Fine Arts Commission

Section 46.5. A palace of fine arts commission is hereby created, which shall, under ordinance, have charge of the development, administration, management and operation of the Palace of Fine Arts and of the lands set aside therefor; provided, however, that the recreation and park commission shall maintain and care for the grounds except those portions of the grounds designated and set aside by the palace of fine arts commission for vehicular parking purposes. The commission shall consist of eleven members, who shall serve without compensation, of which the mayor and the president of the recreation and park commission shall be ex officio members; five of said members need not be residents of the City and County of San Francisco. All appointments to said commission shall be made by the mayor, subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors. The terms of the appointed members of the commission initially appointed shall expire three each at twelve o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1971, 1972 and 1973. Thereafter the term of each appointive member shall be six years. Vacancies on said board shall be filled by the mayor, subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, for the unexpired term becoming vacant.

The commission shall have the power to appoint a secretary and a managing director, each of whom shall hold office at its pleasure, and such other employees as may be provided by the annual budget and annual or supplemental appropriation ordinances, who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The board of supervisors shall annually appropriate to the palace of fine arts commission such amount as may be necessary to defray the cost of maintaining, operating and caring for the property to be maintained and operated by the palace of fine arts commission subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter.

Ordered Submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

Noes: Supervisors Francois, McCarthy, Morrison.
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I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "P"

This proposition would enable the newly restored Palace of Fine Arts to be utilized to its fullest and best potential. The measure would transfer management of the Palace of Fine Arts from the Recreation and Park Commission, which has indicated that it wished to be relieved of the administration of the Palace, to a new citizens group that would be created by this measure.

This new group should not add materially to the costs of city government, because it involves only a transfer of an existing function from the Recreation and Park Commission to the new body. The members of the new commission would not be salaried, and the staff cost would be reflected in one third of one cent addition to the tax rate.

It is vitally important that the restored Palace be utilized fully with activities consistent with its basic purpose. This can best be achieved if a group of San Franciscans, without any other assignment, are devoting their time and attention to the administration of the affairs of the Palace.

The Palace is a unique building and it needs a separate Commission devoting full time to it just as is the case with the deYoung Museum and the Palace of the Legion of Honor, etc.

The citizens of San Francisco and the State of California are both devoting generous appropriations to restore the Palace of Fine Arts, and Mr. Walter Johnson, in an act of unparalleled generosity, gave $2 million for this purpose.

If San Francisco is to realize the full benefits of this restored historic building, the administration of the Palace should be in the hands of a new group whose sole duty is to secure for San Francisco the great benefits that this landmark offers to all of us.

Proposition "P" is endorsed by:

Palace of Fine Arts League

On September 12, 1966, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 8, 1966, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

PROPOSITION "P"

Adds Section 46.5: Creates, under ordinance of Board of Supervisors, Palace of Fine Arts Commission. Charges the commission with the responsibility for the development, administration, management and operation of Palace of Fine Arts.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it is estimated that administrative costs would be increased a minimum of $49,000 per annum, plus an approximate expenditure of $5,000 for equipment or a total of $54,000.

Based on the 1966-67 assessment roll, $54,000 is equivalent to thirty one hundredths (0.31) of one cent in the tax rate.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
PROPOSITION Q

Amends Sections 168.1.1 and 171.1.1: Defines members of Police and Fire Departments, for purposes of Retirement System, as including member on leave of absence employed in another Department of City in correlated work.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 168.1.1 and 171.1.1 thereof, defining membership in the retirement system for persons under the provisions of Section 168.1 (Police Department) and Section 171.1 (Fire Department).

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 8, 1966 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 168.1.1 and 171.1.1 thereof to read as follows:

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

Section 168.1.1. The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context shall have the following meanings:

“Retirement allowance,” “death allowance,” or “allowance” shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, or upon the day following the date of death, as the case may be, and continuing for life unless a different term of payment is definitely provided by the context.

“Compensation,” as distinguished from benefits under the Workmen's Compensation Insurance and Safety Act of the State of California, shall mean the remuneration payable in cash, by the city and county, without deduction except for absence from duty, for time during which the individual receiving such remuneration is a member of the police department, but excluding remuneration paid for overtime.

“Compensation earnable” shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member received compensation without interruption throughout the period under consideration and at the rates of remuneration attached at that time to the ranks or positions held by him during such period, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the rank or position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to becoming a member of the police department, he was in the rank or position first held by him in such department.

“Benefit” shall include “allowance,” “retirement allowance,” “death allowance” and “death benefit.”

“Final compensation” shall mean the average monthly compensation earnable by a member during the three years immediately preceding his retirement, or death before retirement.

For the purpose of the retirement system and of this section, the terms “member of the police department,” “member of the department” or “member” shall mean any officer or employee of the police department whose employment therein began prior to January 1, 1900, or whose employment therein began or shall begin after that date, and was or shall be subject
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to the charter provisions governing entrance requirements for members of the uniformed force of said department, and said terms further shall mean, from the effective date of their employment in said department, persons employed on the effective date hereof regardless of age, or employed after said date at an age not greater than the maximum age then prescribed for entrance into employment in said uniformed force, to perform the duties now performed under the title of criminologist, photographer, police patrol driver, police motor boat operator, woman protective officer, police woman or jail matron (.) , and said terms shall further mean and include those members of the uniformed force of the police department who occupy a position in another department or office of the city and county pursuant to an indefinite leave of absence from said police department to accept promotion to a non-civil service position or promotion to correlated work in such department or office. Any police service performed by such a member of the police department outside the limits of the city and county and under orders of a superior officer of any such member, shall be considered as city and county service, and any disability or death incurred therein shall be covered under the provisions of the retirement system.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 158 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 159 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.

Section 171.1.1. The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meaning:

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

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the Workmen's Compensation Insurance and Safety Act of the State of California shall mean the remuneration payable in cash, by the city and county, without deduction except for absence from duty, for time during which the individual receiving such remuneration is a member of the fire department, but excluding remuneration paid for overtime.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member received compensation without interruption throughout the period under consideration and at the rates of remuneration attached at that time to the ranks or positions held by him during such period, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the rank or position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to becoming a member of the fire department he was in the rank or position first held by him in such department.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," "death allowance" and "death benefit."
"Final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earnable by a member during the three years immediately preceding his retirement, or death before retirement.

For the purpose of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "member of the fire department," "member of the department," or "member" shall mean any officer or employee of the fire department, excluding such officers and employees as are members of the retirement system under section 169 of the charter, who was or shall be subject to the charter provisions governing entrance requirements of members of the uniformed force of said department, and said terms further shall mean, from the effective date of their employment in said department, persons employed on the effective date hereof, regardless of age, or employed after said date at an age not greater than the maximum age then prescribed for entrance into employment in said uniformed force, to perform the duties now performed by members of the salvage corps in the fire department, or duties now performed under the titles of pilot of fireboats, marine engineer of fireboats, marine fireman of fireboats, or hydrant gatemen (\(\text{\_\_\_\_\_}\) ), and said terms shall further mean and include those members of the uniformed force of the fire department who occupy a position in another department or office of the city and county pursuant to an indefinite leave of absence from said fire department to accept promotion to a non-civil service position or promotion to correlated work in such department or office. Any fire service performed by such member of the fire department outside the limits of the city and county and under orders of a superior officer of any such member, shall be considered as city and county service, and any disability or death incurred therein shall be covered under the provisions of the retirement system.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 158 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 159 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.

Ordered Submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 6, 1966.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

Noes: Supervisor Boas.

I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "Q"

Vote No on Proposition "Q"

Voters of San Francisco, reject this proposition! It is unsound legislation, piecemeal in character, and contrary to the best interests of San Francisco's Retirement System.
This unsound proposal is designed to extend Police and Firemen retirement benefits to persons who are not employed in these respective occupations or departments.

Police and Firemen retirement benefits are separate from retirement benefits provided all other City Employees. The very nature of their jobs, hazardous and dangerous, makes it necessary to provide separate retirement benefits for Police and Firemen.

This proposal will extend larger benefits to employees who are not engaged in hazardous, dangerous positions in other City Departments. As a consequence, if this proposal is approved, other groups will seek to obtain these larger benefits by piecemeal legislation. It will establish a dangerous precedent.

Vote NO on this proposition to stop a potential dangerous precedent from becoming an unsound and expensive practice in the future.

Vote NO on Proposition “Q”

This argument is sponsored by the Civil Service Association of San Francisco, Granville DeMerritt, Executive Secretary.

GRANVILLE M. DeMERRITT

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION “Q”

Amends Sections 168.1.1 and 171.1.1: Defines members of police and fire departments, for purposes of retirement system, as including members on leave of absence employed in another department of city in correlated work.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, based on a report prepared by the Employees’ Retirement System, and based on the current level of employees affected, it is estimated that the present annual increase in the cost of government would be $4,891.57. In the future, this amount could vary depending upon the number of police and fire department employees involved.

Based on the 1966-67 assessment roll, $4,891.57 is equivalent to three hundredths (0.03) of one cent in the tax rate.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
18-5
VOTE EARLY
Polls Open From
7 A.M. to 8 P.M.

The Voting
Record Votes
The Points
DOWN.

PROPOSITION

1-A
CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION.
Repeals, amends, and revises various provisions of Constitution relating to
separation of powers, and to the legislative, executive, and judicial de-
partments. Legislature to meet annually, prescribe salaries, prohibit con-
licts of interest, and establish succession to office of Governor. Initiative
procedure changed.

PROPOSITION

1
PUBLIC RETIREMENT FUNDS.
Legislature may authorize investment of 23% of funds of any public retire-
ment fund except Teachers’ Retirement Fund in stock of corporations
and diversified management investment companies.

PROPOSITION

2
BONDS TO PROVIDE STATE COL-
LEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACILI-
TIES. (This act provides for a bond
issue of two hundred thirty million
dollars ($230,000,000).)

PROPOSITION

A
AIRPORT BONDS, 1966. To incur a
bonded indebtedness in the sum of
$95,500,000 for improvement of air
transportation facilities for the City
and County of San Francisco.

PROPOSITION

B
MUNICIPAL TRANSIT SYSTEM
BONDS, 1966. To incur a bonded in-
debtedness in the sum of $95,500,000
for additions to and improvement of
the municipal transit system of the
City and County of San Francisco.

PROPOSITION

C
AMENDS SECTIONS 38 AND
38.01: Defines the duties and respon-
sibilities of Bureau Fire Prevention and
Public Safety. Establishes rates of pay
and methods of promotion in Bureau.

GOVERNOR
VOTE FOR ONE

EDMUND G.
"PAT"
Brown
Democratic
Governor of
the State of
California

RONALD
Reagan
Republican

GLENN M.
Anderson
Democratic
Lieutenant
Governor, State of Calif.

ROBERT H.
Finch
Republican
Attorney at Law

FRANK M.
Jordan
Republican
Secretary of State of California

NORBERT A.
Schlei
Democratic
Assistant
General of the
United States

ALAN Cranston
Democratic
State
Controller

HOUSTON I.
Flourney
Republican
Member of the Assembly, California
Legislature

LIEUTENANT
GOVERNOR
VOTE FOR ONE

SECRETARY OF
STATE
VOTE FOR ONE

CONTROLLER
VOTE FOR ONE
**Proposition 3**
Open Space Conservation. Legislature may define, provide restrictions on use, and establish basis of assessment on open space lands.

**Proposition 4**
Indebtedness of Local Agencies. Local general obligation bonds for library or school purposes may be approved by sixty percent of voters voting on such proposition at primary or general election, including this election.

**Proposition 5**
Property Taxation: Relief in Event of Disaster. Legislature may authorize assessment or reassessment of property in a disaster area damaged or destroyed by major misfortune or calamity.

**Proposition D**
Amends Sections 151.4: Provides that employees with ten or more years service shall be allowed an annual vacation of twenty working days.

**Proposition E**
Amends Sections 35.5.1 and 36.2: Permits Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide longevity pay for policemen and firemen and overtime, night or specialized service pay to all ranks. Limits maximum amount that may be provided.

**Proposition F**
Amends Section 165.2: Prescribes survivor benefits upon death of member of retirement system and restricts benefits paid to member convicted of crime involving moral turpitude.

---

**Treasurer**
Vote for One

**Attorney General**
Vote for One

**Member State Board of Equalization First District**
Vote for One

**Representative in Congress 5th District**
Vote for One

---

9-A
Bert A. Betts
Democratic
Treasurer, State of California

10-A
Ivy Baker
Priest
Republican
Finance Advisor

11-A
Thomas C. Lynch
Democratic
Attorney General of the State of California

12-A
Spencer Williams
Republican
County Counsel Lawyer

13-A
George R. Reilly
Democratic
Incumbent

14-A
Paul Bruce Smith
Republican
Attorney at Law

15-A
Phillip Burton
Democratic
United States Congressman

16-A
Terry Markmacken
Republican
Businessman

ST.
J. B. Mck
Dem
State of Fra
1st. **Move red handle lever of voting machine to the right as far as it will go and leave it there.**

2nd. **To vote for candidates of your choice pull down the pointers over names of the candidates for whom you wish to vote and leave them down.**

**Proposition 6**

TAXATIVE PROCEDURE, Acts become effective 60 days after regular and 90 days after special session. Legislature shall require regular reconsideration of measures pocket vetoed by governor.

**Proposition 7**

COMPENSATION OF COUNTY OFFICERS. Provides supervisors shall fix own salary subject to referendum and also salary of district attorneys and auditors. In charter counties supervisors shall also fix own salary.

**Proposition 8**

TAXATION: INSURANCE COMPANIES; HOME OR PRINCIPAL OFFICE DEDUCTION. Establishes formula and limits amount of real property taxes deductible from gross premiums tax. Includes attorneys in fact as unit with insurance exchanges.

**Proposition G**

SECTION 154: Provides for periodic disciplinary proceedings of civil service commission to return name of terminated probationary employee to eligible list under conditions deemed by commission to be just.

**Proposition H**

AMENDS SECTION 148: Makes technical change permitting civil service commission to return name of terminated probationary employee to eligible list under conditions deemed by commission to be just.

**Proposition I**

AMENDS SECTION 153: Provides that employees' leaves of absence be governed by rules of civil service commission. Requires approval of rule by Board of Supervisors. Permits Board to approve, amend, or reject rule.

**Proposition 6**

VETERANS' TAX EXEMPTION FOR BLIND VETERANS WHOSE TOTAL SERVICE-CONNECTED BLINDNESS EXCEEDS 50%.

---

**Te Senator 18th District**

Dote for one

**State Senator 10th District**

Vote for one

**Member of Assembly 18th District**

Vote for one

**For Chief Justice of the Supreme Court**

For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court

- A. Gene
- 10-A Tom Spinosa
- 19-A George R. Moscone
- 20-A James L. Walker
- 21-A Willie L. Brown, Jr.
- 22-A Julius Kahn, III
- 23-A Roger J. Traynor
- 24-A Louis A. 

Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?
JTE FOR or AGAINST PROPOSITIONS or FOR or AGAINST CONFIR-
MATION OF MEMBER OF BOARD OF EDUCATION; or FOR or AGAINST
SCHOOL OFFICERS, PULL DOWN pointers over words indicating your choice
TAKE THEM DOWN.

THE POINTERS DOWN and move the RED HANDLE of the VOTING
MACHINE to the LEFT registered.

IF IN DOUBT AS TO OPERA-
TIONS FROM THE INSPECTOR.
ATTEMPTING TO VOTE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Statement: Re-</td>
<td>moves from Constitution requirement that Legislature shall require each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taxpayer file annual property state-</td>
<td>ment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Taxes: Legis-</td>
<td>lature may provide for reporting and collecting California personal income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taxes by reference to laws of United</td>
<td>States with exceptions and modifica-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility to Vote: Provides</td>
<td>educational requirement for voting, not applicable to person who on June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, 1952, was 50 years old and resi-</td>
<td>dent of United States 20 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition N</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases membership of Civil Service Commission from three to five members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition Q</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amends Section 74: Repeals limitation of $.0072 per hundred dollars assessed valuation in deficit utility budget for capital cost expenditures and requirement that capital costs in excess thereof be financed through sale of bonds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition P</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adds Section 46.5: Creates, under ordinance of Board of Supervisors, Palace of Fine Arts Commission. Charges the Commission with the responsibility for the development, administration, management and operation of Palace of Fine Arts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35-A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-A</td>
<td>Milton C.</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-A</td>
<td>Robert H.</td>
<td>Mersereau</td>
<td>Siumliord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAVE VOTING TIME — Mark your selections on the polling card NOW — TAKE IT TO THE POLLS ON ELECTION DAY

PROPOSITION 16
OBScenITY, INITIATIVE. Declares state policy is to prohibit obscene matter and conduct. Redefines "obscene" and "knowingly", provides rules and procedure for prosecution and enforcement.

PROPOSITION Q
AMENDS SECTIONS 168.1.1 and 171.1.1: Defines members of Police and Fire Departments, for purposes of retirement system, as including member on leave of absence employed in another department of City in correlated work.

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

ASSESSOR
VOTE FOR ONE

43-A SCOTT M. Shelden
Property Owner

44-A DOROTHY Shinder
Tax Reform Lobbyist

45-A JOSEPH E. Tinney
Incumbent

46-A EDWARD T. Mancuso
Incumbent

PUBLIC DEFENDER
Vote for One

47-A YES
Dr. Laurel Ellen Glass

48-A NO
Alan H. Nichols

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors

49-A YES

50-A NO
VOTE EARLY
Polls Open From
7 A.M. to 8 P.M.

The Voting
Record Votes
The Point
DOWN.

YES
PROPOSITION
CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION
Repeals, amends, and revises various provisions of Constitution relating to separation of powers, and to the legislative, executive, and judicial departments. Legislature to meet annually, prescribe salaries, prohibit conflicts of interest, and establish succession to office of Governor. Initiative procedure changed.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
PUBLIC RETIREMENT FUNDS
Legislature may authorize investment of 25% of funds of any public retirement fund except Teachers' Retirement Fund in stock of corporations and diversified management investment companies.

NO

FOR
PROPOSITION
BONDS TO PROVIDE STATE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACILITIES. (This act provides for a bond issue of two hundred thirty million dollars ($230,000,000).)

AGAINST

YES
PROPOSITION
AIRPORT BONDS, 1966. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $95,500,000 for improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
MUNICIPAL TRANSIT SYSTEM BONDS, 1966. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $96,500,000 for additions to and improvement of the municipal transit system of the City and County of San Francisco.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
AMENDS SECTIONS 38 AND 38.01: Defines the duties and responsibilities of Bureau Fire Prevention and Public Safety. Establishes rates of pay and methods of promotion in Bureau.

NO

GOVERNOR
VOTE FOR ONE

EDMUND G. "PAT" BROWN
Democratic Governor of the State of California

RONALD REAGAN
Republican

GLENN M. ANDERSON
Democratic Lieutenant Governor, State of Calif.

ROBERT H. FINCH
Republican Attorney at Law

FRANK M. JORDAN
Republican Secretary of State of California

NORBERT A. SCHLEI
Democratic Assistant Attorney General of the United States

ALAN CRANSTON
Democratic State Controller

HOUSTON I. FLOURNOY
Republican Member of the Assembly, California Legislature
DIRECTIONS FOR VOTING

PROPOSITION 3
OPEN SPACE CONSERVATION. Legislature may define, provide restrictions on use, and establish basis for assessment on open space lands.

PROPOSITION 4
INDEBTEDNESS OF LOCAL AGENCIES. Local general obligation bonds for library or school purposes may be approved by sixty percent of voters voting on such proposition at primary or general election, including this election.

PROPOSITION 5
PROPERTY TAXATION - RELIEF IN EVENT OF DISASTER. Legislature may authorize assessment or reassessment of property in a disaster area damaged or destroyed by major misfortune or calamity.

PROPOSITION D
AMENDS SECTION 1514: Provides that employers with ten or more employees shall be allowed an annual vacation of twenty working days.

PROPOSITION E
AMENDS SECTIONS 35.5.1 and 36.2: Permits Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide longevity pay for police and firemen and overtime, night or specialized service pay to all ranks. Limits maximum amount that may be provided.

PROPOSITION F
AMENDS SECTION 165.2: Prescribes benefits upon death of member of retirement system and restricts benefits paid to member convicted of crime involving moral turpitude.

TREASURER
VOTE FOR ONE
9-A
BERT A. BEITZ
Democratic Treasurer, State of California

ATTORNEY GENERAL
VOTE FOR ONE
10-A
IVY BAKER PRIEST
Republican Finance Advisor

11-A
THOMAS C. LYNCH
Democratic Attorney General of the State of California

12-A
SPENCER WILLIAMS
Republican County Counsel-Lawyer

13-A
GEORGE R. REILLY
Democratic Incumbent

14-A
PAUL BRUCE SMITH
Republican Attorney at Law

15-A
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
Republican United States Congressman

16-A
LE RUE GRIM
Democratic Lawyer

17-A
J. EUGENE MCCAULiffe
Democratic State Senator
1st. MOVE RED HANDLE LEVER of VOTING MACHINE to the RIGHT as far as will go and LEAVE IT THERE.

2nd. TO VOTE FOR CANDIDATES of your choice pull down the POINTERS over the names of the CANDIDATES for whom you wish to VOTE and LEAVE THEM DOWN.

PROPOSITION 6

VE PROCEDURE. Acts may become effective 60 regular and 90 days after Legislature shall meet, and 30 days after regular session. Shall the measures pocket

PROPOSITION 7

COMPENSATION OF COUNTY OFFICERS. Provides supervisors shall set own salaries at referendum and also salary of district attorneys and auditors. In charter counties supervisors shall also set own salaries.

PROPOSITION 8

TAXATION: INSURANCE COMPANIES: HOME OR PRINCIPAL OFFICE DEDUCTION. Establishes formula for real property tax deduction, limits amount of real property tax deductible. Includes insurance companies.

PROPOSITION 9

VETERANS' TAX EXEMPTION FOR BLIND VETERANS. Tax exempt of 50% for the veteran who became blind in service.

PROPOSITION 10

AMENDS SECTION 153: Provides requirement that an employee's leave of absence be governed by civil service commission. Requires approval of rule by Board of Supervisors. Permits Board to approve, amend, or reject rule.

PROPOSITION 11

AMENDS SECTION 154: Provides that all disciplinary proceedings shall be established by the civil service commission. Shall the measures pocket

STATE SENATOR

10th District

VOTE FOR ONE

MEMBER OF ASSEMBLY

18th District

VOTE FOR ONE

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE

OF THE SUPREME COURT.

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT.

18-A

TOM Spinosa

Republican

Accountant

Tax Consultant

19-A

GEORGE R.

Moscone

Democratic

Member Board of Supervisors

20-A

JAMES L.

Walker

Republican

Businessman

21-A

WILLIE L.

Brown, Jr.

Democratic

Member of the Assembly, 18th District

22-A

JULIUS Kahn, III

Republican

Attorney at Law

23-A

Shall Roger J. Traynor be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

24-A

Shall Louis H. be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?
TO VOTE for a person whose name does not appear on the BALLOT LABEL CARD, raise numbered slide at top of machine corresponding to number of office on OFFICE TITLE CARD, and write name of candidate on paper under slide. (Do not pull down pointer over name of any candidate in office group in which you intend to write in name of a candidate.)

Position 9

Proposition 10

Loans of Public Funds. Legislature may provide for use of public funds to finance restoration of private property damaged in disaster area.

Position 11

Proposition 11

Boxing and Wrestling Contests. Provides legislature may amend, revise, or supplement boxing and wrestling initiative act of November 4, 1924.

Position 12

Proposition 12

County Assessment Boards. Authorizes any create assessment appeals act as board of equalization property in the county.

Position 13

Proposition K

Adds section 36.10: Establishes arbitration board for settling disputes relating to discipline, work schedules, or working conditions between Fire Commission and Arbitration and Grievance Committee of Firemen. Makes finding of Board binding on both parties.

Position L

Proposition L

Amends section 35: Increases membership of police commission from three to five members.

Position M

Proposition M

Amends section 36: Increases membership of Fire Commission from three to five members.

For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court

For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court

For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court

For Presiding Justice District Court of Appe First Appellate Dist Division One

Shall Marshall F. McComb be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

Shall Stanley Mosk be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

Shall Paul Peak be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

Shall Raymond L. Su be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 13</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EALS COUNTY TAX STATEMENT. Repeals from Constitution requirement that Legislature shall require each taxpayer file annual property statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 14</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL INCOME TAXES. Legislature may provide for reporting and collecting California personal income taxes by reference to laws of United States with exceptions and modifications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 15</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE. Provides educational requirement for voting not applicable to person who on June 27, 1952, was 30 years old and resident of United States 20 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition N</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMENDS SECTION 140: Increases membership of Civil Service Commission from three to five members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition O</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMENDS SECTION 74: Repeals limitation of $.0075 per hundred dollars assessed valuation in deficit utility budget for capital cost expenditures and requirement that capital costs in excess thereof be financed through sale of bonds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition P</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDS SECTION 465: Creates, under ordinance of Board of Supervisors, Palace of Fine Arts Commission. Charges the Commission with the responsibility for the development, administration, management and operation of Palace of Fine Arts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 35</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL. First Appellate District Division One.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 36</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL. First Appellate District Division Two.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 37</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL. First Appellate District Division Three.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 38</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL. First Appellate District Division Four.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 39</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL. First Appellate District Division Five.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 40</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL. First Appellate District Division Six.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 41</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON C. JOHNSON, Independent Business Man.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 42</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT H. MERSEREAU, Slumlord.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 35-A</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN B. MOLINARI, Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 36-A</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD M. SIMS, JR., Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 37-A</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTON DEVINE, Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSESSOR

FOR ONE

43-A SCOTT M. SHELDON
Property Owner

44-A DOROTHY SHINDER
Tax Reform Lobbyist

45-A JOSEPH E. TINNEY
Incumbent

PUBLIC DEFENDER

Vote for One

46-A EDWARD T. MANCUSO
Incumbent

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors

47-A YES

Dr. Laurel Ellen Glass

48-A NO

Alan H. Nichols

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors

49-A YES

50-A NO
VOTE EARLY
Polls Open From
7 A.M. to 8 P.M.

YES
PROPOSITION
1-A
CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION. Repeals, amends, and revises various provisions of Constitution relating to separation of powers, and to the legislative, executive, and judicial departments. Legislature to meet annually, prescribe salaries, prohibit conflicts of interest, and establish succession to office of Governor. Initiative procedure changed.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
1
PUBLIC RETIREMENT FUNDS. Legislature may authorize investment of 25% of funds of any public retirement fund except Teachers' Retirement Fund in stock of corporations and diversified management investment companies.

NO

FOR
PROPOSITION
2
BONDS TO PROVIDE STATE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACILITIES. (This act provides for a bond issue of two hundred thirty million dollars ($230,000,000).)

AGAINST

YES
PROPOSITION
A
AIRPORT BONDS. 1966. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $95,500,000 for improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
B
MUNICIPAL TRANSIT SYSTEM BONDS. 1966. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $96,500,000 for additions to and improvements of the municipal transit system of the City and County of San Francisco.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
C
AMENDS SECTIONS 38 AND 38.01: Defines the duties and responsibilities of Bureau Fire Prevention and Public Safety. Establishes rates of pay and methods of promotion in Bureau.

NO

GOVERNOR
VOTE FOR ONE

1
EDMUND G. "PAT" Brown
Democratic Governor of the State of California

2-A
RONALD Reagan
Republican

3-A
GLENN M. Anderson
Democratic Lieutenant Governor, State of Calif.

4-A
ROBERT H. Finch
Republican Attorney at Law

SECRETARY OF STATE
VOTE FOR ONE

5
FRANK M. Jordan
Republican Secretary of State of California

6-A
NORDERT A. Schlei
Democratic Assistant Attorney General of the United States

CONTROLLER
VOTE FOR ONE

7-A
ALAN Cranston
Democratic State Controller

8-A
HOUSTON I. Flourney
Republican Member of the Assembly, California Legislature
1st. Move red handle lever of voting machine to the right as far as it will go and leave it there.

2nd. To vote for candidates of your choice pull down the pointers over names of the candidates for whom you wish to vote and leave them down.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ROPOSITION 6
VE PROCEDURE. Acts become effective 60 days after regular and 90 days after special bills are passed. Legislature shall regularly return bills within 20 days of request. Consideration of measures pocket

ROPOSITION 7
COMPENSATION OF COUNTY OFFICERS. Provides supervisors shall fix own salary subject to referendum and also salary of district attorneys and auditors. In charter counties supervisors shall also fix own salary.

ROPOSITION 8
TAXATION: INSURANCE COMPANIES: HOME OR PRINCIPAL OFFICE DEDUCTION. Establishes formula and limits amount of real property taxes deductible from gross premiums tax. Includes attorneys in fact as unit with insurance exchanges.

ROPOSITION 9
VETERANS' TAX EXEMPTION: PRIOR TO DEATH. Provides tax exemption of $5,000 for the veteran who bears total service-connected disability.

ROPOSITION G
SECTION 154: Provides for disciplinary proceedings shall be established civil service commission, not for the approval of supervisors by ordinance.

ROPOSITION H
AMENDS SECTION 148: Makes technical change permitting civil service commission to return name of terminated probationary employee to eligible list under conditions deemed by commission to be just.

ROPOSITION I
AMENDS SECTION 153: Provides employees' leaves of absence be governed by rules of civil service commission. Requires approval of rule by Board of Supervisors. Permits Board to approve, amend, or reject rule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator District</th>
<th>State Senator 10th District</th>
<th>Member of Assembly 19th District</th>
<th>For Chief Justice of the Supreme Court</th>
<th>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM Spinoza</td>
<td>GEORGE R. Moscone</td>
<td>JAMES L. Walker</td>
<td>CHARLES W. Meyers</td>
<td>EDGAR E. Cullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant-Consultant</td>
<td>Member of Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-A</td>
<td>19-A</td>
<td>20-A</td>
<td>21-A</td>
<td>22-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM Spinoza</td>
<td>GEORGE R. Moscone</td>
<td>JAMES L. Walker</td>
<td>CHARLES W. Meyers</td>
<td>EDGAR E. Cullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant-Consultant</td>
<td>Member of Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-A</td>
<td>19-A</td>
<td>20-A</td>
<td>21-A</td>
<td>22-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall</td>
<td>Shall</td>
<td>Shall</td>
<td>Shall</td>
<td>Shall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>be elected to the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>be elected to the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>be elected to the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>be elected to the term prescribed by law?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO VOTE for a person whose name does not appear on the BALLOT LABEL CARD, raise number slider at top of machine corresponding to number of office on OFFICE TITLE CARD, and write name of candidate on paper under slider. (Do not pull down pointer over name of any candidate in office group in which you intend to write in name of a candidate.)
FOR or AGAINST PROPOSITIONS or FOR or AGAINST CONFIRMATION OF MEMBER OF BOARD OF EDUCATION, or FOR or AGAINST TRAINING OFFICERS, PULL DOWN pointers over words indicating your choice and move the RED HANDLE of the VOTING MACHINE to the LEFT as registered.

IF IN DOUBT AS TO OPERATING PROPOSITIONS FROM THE INSPECTOR ATTEMPTING TO VOTE.

PROPOSITION 13
PEALS LIABILITY TO TAXABLE PROPERTY TAX STATEMENT. Repeals from Constitution requirement that Legislature shall require each taxpayer file annual property statement.

PROPOSITION 14
PERSONAL INCOME TAXES. Legislature may provide for reporting and collecting California personal income taxes by reference to laws of United States with exceptions and modifications.

PROPOSITION 15
ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE. Provides educational requirement for voting not applicable to person who on June 27, 1952, was 50 years old and resident of United States 20 years.

PROPOSITION N
AMENDS SECTION 140: Increases membership of Civil Service Commission from three to five members.

PROPOSITION O
AMENDS SECTION 74: Repeals limitation of $0.0075 per hundred dollars assessed valuation in deficit utility budget for capital cost expenditures and requirement that capital costs in excess thereof be financed through sale of bonds.

PROPOSITION P
ADDRESSES SECTION 46:5: Creates, under ordinance of Board of Supervisors, Palace of Fine Arts Commission. Charges the Commission with the responsibility for the development, administration, management, and operation of the Palace of Fine Arts.

FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
First Appellate District
Division One

FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
First Appellate District
Division Three

FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
First Appellate District
Division One

35-A
36-A
YES
NO
John B. Molinari shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

37-A
38-A
YES
NO
Richard M. Sims, Jr. shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

39-A
40-A
YES
NO
Preston Devine shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

41-A
42-A
SCOTT M. Sheldon
Property Owner

43-A
44-A
DOROTHY Shindler
Tax Reform Lobbyist
**SAMPLE BALLOT**
General Election
NOVEMBER 8, 1966

**TO SAVE VOTING TIME — Mark your selections on the polling place card NOW — TAKE IT TO THE POLLS ON ELECTION DAY**

### STATE

#### PROPOSITIONS

**PROPOSITION 16**
OBScenITY, INITIATIVE. Declares state policy is to prohibit obscene matter and conduct. Redefines "obscene" and "knowingly"; provides rules and procedure for prosecution and enforcement.

**PROPOSITION Q**
AMENDS SECTIONS 168.1.1 and 171.1.1: Defines members of Police and Fire Departments, for purposes of retirement system, as including member on leave of absence employed in another department of City in correlated work.

### CITY & COUNTY

#### PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>43</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SESSOR</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION</td>
<td>MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-A JOSPH E. Tinney incumbent</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors</td>
<td>Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-A MILTON C. Johnson Independent Business Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-A ROBERT H. Mersereau Slumlord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-A EDWARD T. Mancuso Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-A</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>49-A</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-A</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>50-A</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Laurel Ellen Glass
Alan H. Nichols
### Propositions 1-5

#### Proposition 1
**Constitutional Revision, Expense.**
- **Yes:** Repeal of the limit on the number of county employees.
- **No:** Maintain the current limit on county employees.

#### Proposition 2
**Public Retirement Funds.**
- **Yes:**Authorize the investment of 25% of funds from any public retirement fund except Teacher's Retirement Fund in stock of corporations and diversified investment companies.
- **Against:** Maintain the current investment restrictions.

#### Proposition 3
**Open Space Conservation.**
- **Yes:** Require open space to be preserved for public use.
- **No:** Allow development of open space.

#### Proposition 4
**Indebtedness of Local Agencies.**
- **Yes:** Limit the indebtedness of local agencies to 5%.
- **No:** Increase the limit to 10%.

#### Proposition 5
**Property Taxation Relief.**
- **Yes:** Provide tax relief to homeowners.
- **No:** Maintain current tax laws.

### Propositions A-F

#### Proposition A
**Airport Bonds, 1966.**
- **Yes:** Issue $150 million in bonds for airport improvements.
- **No:** Do not issue bonds.

#### Proposition B
**Municipal Transit System Bonds, 1966.**
- **Yes:** Issue $150 million in bonds for transit system improvements.
- **No:** Do not issue bonds.

#### Proposition C
**Amends Sections 38 and 38.5.**
- **Yes:** Amend sections to address public safety.
- **No:** Maintain current sections.

#### Proposition D
**Amends Section 151.4.**
- **Yes:** Amend section to provide an annual vacation of twenty working days.
- **No:** Maintain current section.

#### Proposition E
**Amends Sections 35.1 and 35.2.**
- **Yes:** Amend sections to permit technology and automation.
- **No:** Maintain current sections.

#### Proposition F
**Amends Section 1652.**
- **Yes:** Amend section to protect property owners.
- **No:** Maintain current section.

### Voter Information
- **Governor:** Vote for one candidate.
- **Lieutenant Governor:** Vote for one candidate.
- **Secretary of State:** Vote for one candidate.
- **Controller:** Vote for one candidate.
- **Treasurer:** Vote for one candidate.
- **Attorney General:** Vote for one candidate.
- **Member State Board of Equalization First District:** Vote for one candidate.
- **Representative in Congress 5th District:** Vote for one candidate.
1st. MOVE RED HANDLE LEVER of VOTING MACHINE to the RIGHT as far as it will go and LEAVE IT THERE.

2nd. TO VOTE FOR CANDIDATES of your choice pull down the POINTERS over the names of the CANDIDATES for whom you wish to VOTE and LEAVE THEM DOWN.

PROPOSITION 6
FIVE PROCEDURE. Act etc. become effective 60 regular and 90 days after 1st. Session of Legislature shall review and reconsider measures pocket

PROPOSITION 7
COMPENSATION OF COUNTY OFFICERS. Provides supervisors shall fix own salary subject to referendum and also salary of district attorneys and auditors. In charter counties supervisors shall also fix own salary.

PROPOSITION 8
TAXATION: INSURANCE COMPANIES; HOME OR PRINCIPAL OFFICE DEDUCTION. Establishes formula and limits amount of real property taxes deductible from gross premiums. Tax. Includes attorneys in fact as unit with insurance exchanges.

PROPOSITION G
SECTION 154: Provides in case of disciplinary proceedings shall be established a civil service commission, amendment or approval by supervisors by ordinance.

PROPOSITION H
AMENDS SECTION 148: Makes technical change permitting civil service commission to return name of terminated probationary employee to eligible list under conditions deemed by commission to be just.

PROPOSITION I
AMENDS SECTION 153: Provides that employees' leaves of absence be governed by rules of civil service commission. Requires approval of rule by Board of Supervisors. Permits Board to approve, amend, or reject rule.

PROPOSITION J
AMENDS SECTION 158: Provides to practice in all courts at least two years' service in offices of District Attorney and

18th Senator 10th District
VOTE FOR ONE

STATE SENATOR
10th District
VOTE FOR ONE

MEMBER OF ASSEMBLY
20th District
VOTE FOR ONE

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

23-A YES
24-A NO
25-A YES

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

 Shall Roger J. Traynor be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

Louis H. be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?
TO VOTE for a person whose name does not appear on the BALLOT LABEL CARD, raise numbered slide at top of machine corresponding to number of office on OFFICE TITLE CARD, and write name of candidate on paper under slide. (Do not pull down pointer over name of any candidate in office group in which you intend to write in name of a candidate.)

PROPOSITION 9
TAX EXEMPTION FOR VETERANS. Authorizes $5,000 on home of veteran of permanent disability is

PROPOSITION 10
LOANS OF PUBLIC FUNDS. Legislature may provide for use of public funds to finance restoration of private property damaged in disaster area.

PROPOSITION 11
BOXING AND WRESTLING CONTESTS. Provides Legislature may amend, revise, or supplement existing law regarding boxing and wrestling contests, if enacted by Nov. 4, 1924.

PROPOSITION 12
COUNTY ASSESSMENT BOARDS. Authorizes any person to appeal assessment to board of equalization, property in the county.

PROPOSITION 14
CONVICTS 34: Removes requirement for segregated courts of state for convicts prior to appointment of County Attorney, District Attorney, and Public Defender.

PROPOSITION K
ADDS SECTION 36.10: Establishes arbitration board for settling disputes relating to discipline, work schedules, or working conditions between Fire Commission and Arbitration and Grievance Committee of Firemen. Makes finding of Board binding on both parties.

PROPOSITION L
AMENDS SECTION 35: Increases membership of Police Commission from three to five members.

PROPOSITION M
AMENDS SECTION 36: Increases membership of Fire Commission from three to five members.

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
First Appellate District Division One

Shall Marshall F. McComb be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

Shall Stanley Mosk be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

Shall Paul Peck be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

Shall Raymond L. Sulentic be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?
THE POINTERS DOWN and move the RED HANDLE of the VOTING MACHINE to the LEFT and registered.

IF IN DOUBT AS TO OPERATIONS FROM THE INSPECTOR ATTEMPTING TO VOTE.

PROPOSITION 13
PROPERTY TAX STATEMENT. Removes from Constitution requirement that Legislature shall require each taxpayer file annual property statement.

PROPOSITION 14
PERSONAL INCOME TAXES. Legislature may provide for reporting and collecting California personal income taxes by reference to laws of United States with exceptions and modifications.

PROPOSITION 15
ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE. Provides educational requirement for voting not applicable to person who on June 27, 1952, was 30 years old and resident of United States 20 years.

PROPOSITION N
AMENDS SECTION 140. Increases membership of Civil Service Commission from three to five members.

PROPOSITION O
AMENDS SECTION 74: Repeals limitation of $.0075 per hundred dollars assessed valuation in deficit utility budget for capital cost expenditures and requirement that capital costs in excess thereof be financed through sale of bonds.

ADDS SECTION 16.5: Creates, under ordinance of Board of Supervisors, Palace of Fine Arts Commission. Charges the Commission with the responsibility for the development, administration, management and operation of Palace of Fine Arts.

FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
First Appellate District Division One

FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
First Appellate District Division Three

FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
First Appellate District Division Three

John B. Molinari
Richard M. Sims, Jr.
Preston Devine

Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

JOSEPH E. Tinney
Incumbent

MILTON C. Johnson
Independent Business Man.
SAMPLE BALLOT
General Election
November 8, 1966

To save voting time—Mark your selections on the polling place card now—take it to the polls on election day.

Proposition 16
OBScenity, Initiative. Declares state policy is to prohibit obscene matter and conduct. Redefines "obscene" and "knowingly"; provides rules and procedure for prosecution and enforcement.

Proposition Q
Amends sections 168.1.1 and 171.1.1. Defines members of Police and Fire Departments, for purposes of retirement system, as including member on leave of absence employed in another department of City in correlated work.

State Propositions

City & County Propositions

ASSESSOR
Vote for one

43-A Robert H. Mersereau
Slumlord

44-A Scott M. Sheldon
Property Owner

45-A Dorothy Shinder
Tax Reform Lobbyist

46-A Edward T. Mancuso
Incumbent

47-A YES
Dr. Laurel Ellen Glass

48-A NO
Alan H. Nichols

49-A YES

50-A NO

Public Defender
Vote for one

Member of the Board of Education
Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors

Member of the Board of Education
Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors
## Proposition 1-A
### CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION
- **YES**
- **NO**
- **Repeals, amends, and revises various provisions of Constitution relating to separation of powers, and to the legislative, executive, and judicial departments.**
- **Legislature to meet annually, prescribe salaries, prohibit conflicts of interest, and establish succession to office of Governor. Initiative procedure changed.**

## Proposition 1
### PUBLIC RETIREMENT FUNDS
- **YES**
- **NO**
- **Legislature may authorize investment of 25% of funds of any public retirement fund except Teachers' Retirement Fund in stock of corporations and diversified management investment companies.**

## Proposition 2
### BONDS TO PROVIDE STATE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACILITIES
- **For**
- **Against**
- **Bonds to provide state college and university facilities. (This act provides for a bond issue of two hundred thirty million dollars ($230,000,000).)**

## Proposition A
### AIRPORT BONDS, 1966
- **YES**
- **NO**
- **To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $95,500,000 for improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco.**

## Proposition B
### MUNICIPAL TRANSIT SYSTEM BONDS, 1966
- **YES**
- **NO**
- **To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $96,500,000 for additions to and improvements of the municipal transit system of the City and County of San Francisco.**

## Proposition C
### AMENDS SECTIONS 38 AND 38.01
- **YES**
- **NO**
- **Defines the duties and responsibilities of Bureau Fire Prevention and Public Safety. Establishes rates of pay and methods of promotion in Bureau.**

### 1. VOTE FOR ONE
- **GOVERNOR**
- **EDMUND G. "PAT" BROWN**
  - Democratic Governor of the State of California
- **LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR**
  - GLENN M. ANDERSON
  - Democratic Lieutenant Governor, State of Calif.
- **SECRETARY OF STATE**
  - ROBERT H. FINCH
  - Republican Attorney at Law
- **CONTROLLER**
  - FRANK M. JORDAN
  - Republican Secretary of State of California
  - NORBERT A. SCHLEI
  - Democratic Assistant Attorney General of the United States
  - ALAN CRANSTON
  - Democratic State Controller
  - HOUSTON I. FLOUROY
  - Republican Member of the Assembly, California Legislature
DIRECTION FOR VOTING

PROPOSITION 3
OPEN SPACE CONSERVATION. Legislature may define, provide restrictions on use, and establish basis of assessment on open space lands.

PROPOSITION 4
INDEBTEDNESS OF LOCAL AGENCIES. Local general obligation bonds for library or school purposes may be approved by sixty percent of voters voting on such proposition at primary or general election, including this election.

PROPOSITION 5
PROPERTY TAXATION: RELIEF IN EVENT OF DISASTER. Legislature may authorize assessment of property in a disaster area damaged or destroyed by major misfortune or calamity.

PROPOSITION D
AMENDS SECTION 151.4: Provides that employees with ten or more years service shall be allowed an annual vacation of twenty working days.

PROPOSITION E
AMENDS SECTIONS 35.5.1 and 36.2: Permits Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide longevity pay for policemen and firemen and overtime, night or specialized service pay to all ranks. Limits maximum amount that may be provided.

PROPOSITION F
AMENDS SECTION 165.2: Prescribes survivor benefits upon death of member of retirement system and restricts benefits to member convicted of crime involving moral turpitude.

Legislative session convened. Other session convened if vetoed.

TREASURER
VOTE FOR ONE

ATTORNEY GENERAL
VOTE FOR ONE

Member State Board of Equalization
First District
VOTE FOR ONE

Representative in Congress
6th District
VOTE FOR ONE

9-A BERT A. BETTS
Democratic
Treasurer, State of California

10-A IVY BAKER PRIEST
Republican
Finance Advisor

11-A THOMAS C. LYNCH
Democratic
Attorney General, State of California

12-A SPENCER WILLIAMS
Republican
County Counsel-Lawyer

13-A GEORGE R. REILLY
Democratic
Incumbent

14-A PAUL BRUCE SMITH
Republican
Attorney at Law

15-A WILLIAM S. MAILIARD
Republican
United States Congressman

16-A LaRUE GRIM
Democratic
Lawyer

17-A J. EUG McA.
Democratic
State Senator, State of S. Franc
1st. MOVE RED HANDLE LEVER of VOTING MACHINE to the RIGHT as far as it will go and LEAVE IT THERE.

2nd. TO VOTE FOR CANDIDATES of your choice pull down the POINTERS over the names of the CANDIDATES for whom you wish to VOTE and LEAVE THEM DOWN.

PROPOSITION 6

VE PROCEDURE, Acts become effective 60 regular and 90 days after Legislature shall re-consider measures pocket

PROPOSITION 7

COMPENSATION OF COUNTY OFFICERS. Provides supervisors shall fix own salary subject to referendum and also salary of district attorneys and auditors. In charter counties supervisors shall also fix own salary.

PROPOSITION 8

TAXATION: INSURANCE COMPANIES: HOME OR PRINCIPAL OFFICE DEDUCTION. Establishes formula and limits amount of real property taxes deductible from gross premiums tax. Includes attorneys in fact as unit with insurance exchanges.

PROPOSITION G

SECTION 154: Provides 3 of disciplinary proceedings shall be established civil service commission, amendment or approval by supervisors by ordinance.

PROPOSITION H

AMENDS SECTION 148: Makes technical change permitting civil service commission to return name of terminated probationary employee to eligible list under conditions deemed by commission to be just.

PROPOSITION I

AMENDS SECTION 153: Provides that employees' leaves of absence be governed by rules of civil service commission. Requires approval of rule by Board of Supervisors. Permits Board to approve, amend, or reject rule.

E SENATOR 10th District

STATE SENATOR 10th District

MEMBER OF ASSEMBLY 20th District

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT

Shall Roger J. Traynor be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

Shall Louis H. Handy be elected to the term prescribed by law?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase term of appellate court judges from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increase term of appellate court judges from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increase term of appellate court judges from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase term of appellate court judges from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Increase term of appellate court judges from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Increase term of appellate court judges from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Increase term of appellate court judges from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Increase term of appellate court judges from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Increase term of appellate court judges from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Increase term of appellate court judges from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Increase term of appellate court judges from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Increase term of appellate court judges from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Votes:**

- Marjorie Burke: Yes
- Marshall F. McComb: No
- Stanley Moss: No
- Paul Peek: No
- Raymond L. S.: Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSITION 13</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX STATEMENT. Removes from Constitution requirement that Legislature shall require each taxpayer file annual property statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSITION 14</td>
<td>PERSONAL INCOME TAXES. Legislature may provide for reporting and collecting California personal income taxes by reference to laws of United States with exceptions and modifications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE. Provides educational requirement for voting not applicable to person who on June 27, 1952, was 80 years old and resident of United States 20 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSITION N</td>
<td>AMENDS SECTION 140: Increases membership of Civil Service Commission from three to five members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSITION O</td>
<td>AMENDS SECTION 74: Repeals limitation of $10,750 per hundred dollars assessed valuation in deficit utility budget for capital cost expenditures and requirement that capital costs in excess thereof be financed through sale of bonds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDS SECTION 46.5: Creates, under ordinance of Board of Supervisors, Palace of Fine Arts Commission. Charges the Commission with the responsibility for the development of arts, administration, management and operation of Palace of Fine Arts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL</th>
<th>FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL</th>
<th>FOR JUSTICE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-A</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>36-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B. Molinari</td>
<td>Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Richard M. Sims, Jr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MACHINE to the LEFT registered.
IF IN DOUBT AS TO OPERATIONS FROM THE INSPECTOR ATTEMPTING TO VOTE.
SFM 4 \( \frac{3}{5} \) SAN FRANCISCO - Registration of Voters

as far as it will go and you have voted and your vote is

ING THE VOTING MACHINE, REQUEST INSTRU-
CION OR JUDGE OF THE ELECTION BOARD BEFORE

--- SAMPLE BALLOT ---
General Election
NOVEMBER 8, 1966

--- TO SAVE VOTING TIME --- Mark your selections on the polling
place card NOW --- TAKE IT TO THE POLLS ON ELECTION DAY ---

### STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSITION 16</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSCENITY, INITIATIVE. Declares state policy is to prohibit obscene matter and conduct. Redefines 'obscene' and 'knowingly'; provides rules and procedure for prosecution and enforcement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>43</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSOR</strong></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC DEFENDER</strong></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td>Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td>Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>43-A</th>
<th>44-A</th>
<th>45-A</th>
<th>46-A</th>
<th>47-A</th>
<th>48-A</th>
<th>49-A</th>
<th>50-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT H. MERSEREAU</td>
<td>SCOTT M. SHELDON</td>
<td>DOROTHY SHINDER</td>
<td>EDWARD T. MANCUSO</td>
<td>Dr. Laurel Ellen Glass</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>48-A</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slumlord</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Tax Reform Lobbyist</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Laurel Ellen Glass

Alan H. Nichols
### Propositions

#### Proposition 1-A
**Constitutional Revision.**
Repeals, amends, and revises various provisions of Constitution relating to separation of powers, and to the legislative, executive, and judicial departments. Legislature to meet annually, prescribe salaries, prohibit conflicts of interest, and establish succession to office of Governor. Initiative procedure changed.

#### Proposition 1
**Public Retirement Funds.**
Legislature may authorize investment of 25% of funds of any public retirement fund except Teachers' Retirement Fund in stock of corporations and diversified management investment companies.

#### Proposition 2
**Bonds to Provide State College and University Facilities.**
(This act provides for a bond issue of two hundred thirty million dollars ($230,000,000).)

#### Proposition A
**Airport Bonds, 1966.**
To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $95,500,000 for improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco.

#### Proposition B
**Municipal Transit System Bonds, 1966.**
To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $96,500,000 for additions to and improvement of the municipal transit system of the City and County of San Francisco.

#### Proposition C
**Amends Sections 38 and 38.01.**
Defines the duties and responsibilities of Bureau Fire Prevention and Public Safety. Establishes rates of pay and methods of promotion in Bureau.

### Voting Offices

- **1:** Governor
- **2:** Lieutenant Governor
- **3:** Secretary of State
- **4:** Controller
- **5:** Proposition A
- **6:** Proposition B
- **7:** Proposition C
- **8:** Proposition 1-A
- **9:** Proposition 1
- **10:** Proposition 2

**Governor:**
- Edmund G. "PAT" Brown (Democrat for the State of California)
- Ronald Reagan (Republican)
- Glenn M. Anderson (Republican for Lieutenant Governor of the State of Calif.)
- Robert H. Finch (Republican for Attorney at Law)
- Frank M. Jordan (Republican for Secretary of State of California)
- Norbert A. Schlei (Democratic for Assistant Attorney General of the United States)
- Alan Cranston (Democratic for State Controller)
- Houston I. Flourney (Republican for Member of the Assembly, California Legislature)
### Proposition 3
**Open Space Conservation**
Legislature may define, provide restrictions on use, and establish basis of assessment on open space lands.

### Proposition 4
**Indebtedness of Local Agencies**
Local general obligation bonds for library or school purposes may be approved by sixty percent of voters voting on such proposition at primary or general election, including this election.

### Proposition 5
**Property Taxation: Relief in Event of Disaster**
Legislature may authorize assessment or re-assessment of property in a disaster area damaged or destroyed by major misfortune or calamity.

### Proposition 6
**Amends Section 151.4**
Provides that employees with ten or more years service shall be allowed an annual vacation of twenty working days.

### Proposition 7
**Amends Sections 35.5.1 and 36.2**
Permits Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide longevity pay for policemen and firemen and overtime, night or specialized service pay to all ranks. Limits maximum amount that may be provided.

### Proposition 8
**Amends Section 165.2**
Prescribes survivor benefits upon death of member of retirement system and restricts benefits paid to member convicted of crime involving moral turpitude.

### Treasurer
**Vote For One**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>State or District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bert A. Betts</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Treasurer, State of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ivy Baker Priest</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Thomas C. Lynch</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Spencer Williams</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>George R. Reilly</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Paul Bruce Smith</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>William S. Mailliard</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Congressman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lerue Grim</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representative in Congress
**Vote For One**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>State or District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1st. MOVE RED HANDLE LEVER of VOTING MACHINE to the RIGHT as far as it will go and LEAVE IT THERE.

2nd. TO VOTE FOR CANDIDATES of your choice pull down the POINTERS over the names of the CANDIDATES for whom you wish to VOTE and LEAVE THEM THERE.

6. PROPOSITION COMPENSATION OF COUNTY OFFICERS. Provides supervisors shall fix own salary subject to referendum and also salary of district attorneys and auditors. In charter counties supervisors shall also fix own salary.

7. PROPOSITION TAXATION. INSURANCE COMPANIES; HOME OR PRINCIPAL OFFICE DEDUCTION. Establishes formula and limits amount of real property taxes deductible from gross premiums tax. Includes attorneys in fact as unit with insurance exchanges.

9. PROPOSITION VETERANS' TAX EXEMPTION FOR BLIND VETERANS. Tax exemption of $2,500 for veteran who because of partial or total service-connected blindness.

G. PROPOSITION SECTION 154: Provides that disciplinary proceedings shall be established by civil service commission, and amendments or approval by supervisors by ordinance.

H. PROPOSITION AMENDS SECTION 148: Makes technical change permitting civil service commission to return name of terminated probationary employee to eligible list under conditions deemed by commission to be just.

I. PROPOSITION AMENDS SECTION 153: Provides that employees' leaves of absence be governed by rules of civil service commission. Requires approval of rule by Board of Supervisors. Permits Board to approve, amend, or reject rule.

J. PROPOSITION AMENDS SECTION 156: Requires that attorney practicing in all cases be an attorney for at least two years and current in office of District Attorney and Public Defender.

E. SENATOR 10th District

STATE SENATOR 23rd District

MEMBER OF ASSEMBLY 23rd District

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

18. TOM SPINOSA

19. GEORGE R. MOSCONI

20. JAMES L. WALKER

21. JOHN FRANCIS FORAN

22. NICK VERREOS

23. Roderick J. TRAYNOR

24. Louis H.

18-A Republican Accountant

19-A Democratic Member Board of Supervisors

20-A Republican Businessman

21-A Democratic Incumbent

22-A Republican Independent Businessman

23-A Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

24-A Shall be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Proposition K: Exemption from Exemption. Authorizes state to exempt from public funds 5,000 for the blind of permanent disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Proposition L: Boxer and Wrestling Contests. Allows the legislature to amend, revise, or supplement the law pertaining to boxing and wrestling initiative act of November 4, 1924.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Proposition M: County Assessment Board. Authorizes the creation of an assessment board to act as the board of equalization in the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Proposition N: Establishes arbitration board for settling disputes relating to discipline, working conditions, and grievance committee of Firemen. Makes finding of Board binding on both parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Proposition O: Increases membership of Police Commission from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Proposition P: Increases the membership of Fire Commissioners from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Proposition Q: Increases the membership of Fire Commissioners from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Proposition R: Increases the membership of Fire Commissioners from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Proposition S: Increases the membership of Fire Commissioners from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Proposition T: Increases the membership of Fire Commissioners from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Proposition U: Increases the membership of Fire Commissioners from three to five members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Propositions:***

- Proposition 34: Removes the requirement that courts of state must be appointed by the governor prior to appointment of the District Public Defender.

- Proposition 35: Establishes arbitration board for settling disputes relating to discipline, working conditions, or working conditions between Fire Commission and Arbitration and Grievance Committee of Firemen. Makes finding of Board binding on both parties.

- Proposition 36: Increases membership of Police Commission from three to five members.

**For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court:**

- Shall Marshall F. McComb be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

- Shall Stanley Mosk be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

- Shall Paul Peak be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

- Shall Raymond L. S. be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?
O SAVE VOTING TIME—Mark your selections on the polling place card NOW—TAKE IT TO THE POLLS ON ELECTION DAY

STATE PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION 16
OBSCENITY, INITIATIVE. Declares state policy is to prohibit obscene matter and conduct. Redefines "obscene" and "knowingly"; provides rules and procedure for prosecution and enforcement.

PROPOSITION 2
AMENDS SECTIONS 168.1.1 and 171.1.1. Defines members of Police and Fire Departments, for purposes of retirement system, as including member on leave of absence employed in another department of City in correlated work.

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

ASSSESSOR
VOTE FOR ONE

43 44 45
PUBLIC DEFENDER Vote for One
46
MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors
47 48
MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors
49 50

46-A YES
47-A YES
48-A NO
49-A YES
50-A NO

DOROTHY Shinder
Tax Reform Lobbyist

JOSEPH E. TINNEY Incumbent

MILTON C. JOHNSON Independent Business Man

EDWARD T. MANCUSO Incumbent

Dr. Laurel Ellen Glass

Alan H. Nichols